RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF JUDAISM FROM MOSES TO OUR DAYS.

BENISCH

JUDAISM SURVEYED:

BEING A SKETCH OF THE

RISE AND DEVELOPMENT OF JUDAISM.

FROM MOSES TO OUR DAYS,

IN A SERIES OF FIVE LECTURES,

DELIVERED IN ST. GEORGE'S HALL,

BY

DR. A. BENISCH.

LONDON:

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO.,

1874.

London:
Printed by S. Meldola,
7, King Street, Snow Hill, City.

TO THE MEMORY
OF HER WHO MADE ME WHAT I AM,
TO WHOM I WAS ALL IN ALL,
WHOSE LAST ARTICULATED WORD WAS UTTERED
TO BREATHE COMFORT TO ME;
WHOSE EYE SPOKE TO ME WHEN THE TONGUE NO LONGER COULD;
WHOSE LAST PHYSICAL POWER
WAS EXERTED IN A PRESSURE OF MY HAND,
STILL THRILLING THROUGH MY FRAME,
WHEN THE EYE, FIXED IN DEATH, WAS NO LONGER
ABLE TO FOLLOW ME.
WITH HER THE SUBJECT OF THESE LECTURES
IN HAPPIER, ALAS! BY-GONE DAYS,
OFTEN FORMED THE THEME OF GRAVE CONVERSATIONS.

THOU ART GONE!
AND, WITH THEE, MY GUARDIAN ANGEL
AND THE JOY OF MY LIFE.

SOON THE ALLOTTED SPAN OF TIME WILL BE PASSED OVER,
AND THEN — NO MORE SEPARATION.

PREFACE.

The lectures contained in this volume have been published in compliance with the wish of some who attended their delivery, and of many more who read the notices of them in the general and Jewish press. A number of remarks have been added under the title of Concluding Chapter. In this the lecturer has explained the objects for the attainment of which he engaged in this labour. A few explanatory notes have likewise been subjoined. They will be found at the end of the volume.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JUDAISM SURVEYED.

BEING A SKETCH OF ITS RISE AND DEVELOPMENT FROM MOSES TO OUR DAYS.

DIVIDED INTO FOUR PERIODS.

PERIOD I.

From Moses (1575) to Ezra (460 B.C.).

IT is admitted on all hands that Judaism is one of the most ancient religions in existence. Its preservation during so many millennia, amidst vicissitudes which scores of times threatened it with destruction, is a greater marvel than that of those stupendous monuments of antiquity of which it has been said that from their summits 4,000 years looked down upon mankind. During this period it has, of course, passed through many phases, has come into contact, and not rarely also into collision, with the religions, civilisations, and ethical codes of the most powerful and most advanced nations of ancient and modern times; has naturally acted upon and in its turn been influenced by them; has contributed its share towards their formation; nay, has impressed upon them some of its characteristics so deeply that it cannot be imagined by what events or length of time they could be effaced.

Nor was Judaism less calculated to excite attention by its extraordinary vitality, enabling it to survive the

shocks which sufficed to overthrow the religions of nations in possession of advantages infinitely surpassing those enjoyed by the Jews, than by peculiarities that made themselves acutely felt in every relation of life in which this people stood to the rest of mankind. Indeed, so well marked were these peculiarities that they must have profoundly struck the reflecting among the populations with which the Jews came into contact. That such was actually the case, and that this, moreover, lay in the design of the author of this system, is evident from several references in the ancient historical records of this people. This design is clearly shown by the fact that the Lawgiver designates Israel as a peculiar treasure, as the Lord's select portion, and a kingdom of priests (Exod. xix., 5 & 6). In other places the nations of the earth are introduced as calling Israel a great and wise people on account of its laws (Deut. iv., 6), and, again, as descanting upon some of its characteristic institutions (Ibid li., 23). But still more clearly expressed is this in the following address of Moses to God (Exod. xxxiii., 16): "For wherein then shall it be known that I and thy people have found grace in thy sight? Is it not in that thou goest with us? So shall we be distinct, I and thy people, from all the people that are upon the face of the earth." That at an early period already these peculiarities were noticed among the surrounding nations, appears from several allusions in the same writings. Balaam declared when called to curse Israel: "Lo, the people shall dwell alone, and shall not be reckoned among the nations," (Numb. xviii., 9). Most remarkable in this respect is the prayer offered up by Solomon at the dedication of the Temple. He

prayed: "Moreover, concerning a stranger that is not of thy people Israel, but cometh out of a far country for thy name's sake; for they shall hear of thy great name and thy strong hand, and of thy stretched-out arm, when he shall come and pray towards this house; hear thou in heaven thy dwelling place, and do according to all that the stranger calleth to Thee for, that all people of the earth may know thy name, to fear Thee as do thy people Israel," (I. Kings, viii., 41, 43). Again, upon Jonah's announcement to the ship's crew (Jonah, i, 10), that he was a Hebrew "fearing the God who made the sea and the land," they were seized with terror, evidently because Israel and its peculiar worship were not unknown to them. Equally, if not more striking, is the effect produced upon the Ninevites by the prophet's preaching, which can only be accounted for on the assumption that they were not unacquainted with his religion. Still more distinctly are these characteristics referred to, although malignantly exaggerated and distorted by Haman, when he describes this people to King Ahasuerus as having institutions differing from those of all other nations, (Esther, iii., 8). Daniel's relation to Nebuchadnezzar and Darius, and the proclamation of Cyrus to the exiles (II. Chron., xxxvi., 23; Ezra, i., 2—4) may likewise be referred to as conclusive proofs that these rulers were not unacquainted with Israel's law. In the book of Judith the Ammonite, Achior seems to be fully acquainted and impressed with Israel's extraordinary history and peculiar institutions, of which he gives an account to Holofernes (the whole of chap. v.) Here we see all the constituents of a missionary people intended to draw

attention to its tenets, not by words, but by practices and deeds well calculated to strike the imagination and impress the mind. And that in prophetic opinion this object would be attained is evident from the predictions in which the nations of the earth are represented as appearing from new moon to new moon, and sabbath to sabbath, to worship before Gcd (Isaiah, lxvi 23). The lx. and lxi. chapters of this book are conceived in the same missionary spirit. The prophecies of Zachariah towards the end of chapter viii., in the book called after him, are pregnant with the same spirit, and his last prophecy in chapter xiv. is equally explicit on this momentous subject. Several psalms, and especially Psalm lxi., breathe a similar spirit.

In later times we meet with designed efforts to acquaint the Pagan world with Israel's history and institutions. To this fact evidence is borne by the writings of Philo and Josephus, and, perhaps, also by the Greek translation of the Hebrew Scriptures, although the probability is that it was originally intended only for the use of the Alexandrian Jews, among whom a knowledge of the Hebrew language seemed to have become extinct.

To a certain extent, and regarded from a certain point of view, the New Testament, in so far as it emanated from Jews, may also be considered in the light of an exposition of this kind. It is especially the writings of Paul which bear this impress. They are remarkable not only for their matter, which gives to Judaism a novel aspect, but also for the method, until then quite unknown beyond the pale of the synagogue. Those familiar with the argumentation of the Rabbis, may well

fancy, in reading any of his epistles, that they are perusing a translation of some portion of the Talmud.

The history of the Jewish literature makes mention at later periods of expositions of Judaism by Jews. If these expositions were not always intended for gentile nations, they were at least made accessible to them, as they were not presented in Hebrew, but in the languages of the countries of their respective expounders.

But most of these expositions labour under a defect which impresses upon them the stamp of incompleteness, and they thus fail in conveying to the inquirer a correct idea of the system which he is anxious to know. Most of these expositions to a great extent move within the circle of the institutions set forth in the books of Moses; frequently neglecting the consideration of the extraordinary development of the system which it experienced in the course of long centuries, of the interpretations to which it was subject at the hand of those who had to administer these institutions, and lastly of the expansions, contractions, modifications, and accommodations, which they had to undergo in consequence of the changes which time necessarily brings on, but chiefly owing to the collisions into which they came, from time to time, with the laws, habits, prejudices, religions, and civilisations of the nations among which Jewish colonies had found a refuge. The most prominent among these expositions are: that of Maimonides, in the 12th century, originally composed in Arabic, contained in the well known work, "The Guide of the Perplexed," the third part of which is devoted to such an exposition; to some extent that of Benedict Spinoza, in the 17th century, composed in Latin, and entitled,

"Tractatus Theologico-politicus," that of Moses Mendelssohn, in the 18th century, written in German, under the name of "Jerusalem"; in our days, that of J. Salvador, written in French, entitled "Histoire des Institutions de Moise" ; that by the late Professor Munk, likewise written in French, contained in his "Palestine;" that by Rabbi Hirsch, of Frankfort-on-the-Maine, in German, entitled, "Horeb," and, lastly, that by Dr. Philippsohn, of Bonn, likewise in German, entitled, "The Development of the Religious Idea in Judaism, Christianity, and Mahomedanism," an excellent English translation of which, by Miss Goldsmid, was published in 1855.

Meritorious as some of these expositions are, the synagogue, as such, ignored them altogether. They were considered by her as mere theories, as philosophical speculations, which may or may not represent Judaism in its true light, to which, therefore, no influence should be allowed in the practice of the rites enjoined. Nay, some of these expositions were regarded by eminent Rabbis with grave suspicion, if not absolute hostility. Thus, the Greek translation of the Pentateuch is deplored in the Talmud as a national calamity. The reason assigned, is the inadequacy of the version to convey a truthful idea of the original, and the consequent apprehension, lest the translation should lead its readers into error and give rise to misunderstandings and heresies. Experience showed that this fear was not quite unfounded ; for when at a later period Christianity arose, several of its statements which the rabbis considered as erroneous, were defended on the ground of certain Greek renderings, not borne out by the original? (1) In the same way Maimonides'

celebrated work, referred to before, called forth a controversy among the rabbis of the time, which has not yet altogether subsided; and the anathema which was hurled against it, not long after its appearance, is probably, even in our days, thought justifiable by that school of Jewish orthodoxy which dreads the philosophical tone of the work, and the high influence of the author's reputation.

Such, of course, is also the light in which the survey in which I am engaged must be regarded. It is simply an individual view, reflecting an individual mind, although based on the study of the original sources and discussions with kindred minds.

But if this survey is to answer its purpose, it must steer clear of two rocks on which it might be wrecked. These are biblical criticism and revelation. Happily this is easy of accomplishment, since, for the object of my survey, it is immaterial whether the result arrived at by modern advanced biblical critics be received or not. Whether the Pentateuch is believed to be the work of Moses or of some later author or authors; whether it consists of mere fragments or is the production of one mind; whether there are in it interpolations, discrepancies, or even contradictions or not; whether its contents proceeded supernaturally from the divine mind, or are the ideas of a finite human being, cannot affect in the least the object of this survey. Suffice it that the mass of the Hebrews, so far as authentic history can go back, and their overwhelming majority, to this day, have considered the Pentateuch, and indeed the Hebrew Scripture in general, as inspired by the Deity; consequently, as the production of an external super-

natural revelation, and the former in addition as a direct emanation from God, Moses having only performed the functions, as it were, of an amanuensis, simply recording the communications from on high vouchsafed to him (2). Judaism, as a religious system, was evidently shaped and developed under the influence of this belief. The effect in either case must be the same; history, the thread of which I am following, having pursued its course unaffected by the views of the critical school. If its followers cannot perceive with the supernaturalist in the Bible the work of an objective, *i.e.*, external, they may yet find no difficulty in viewing it as the production of an internal, *i.e.* subjective, progressive revelation, gradually evolved, as the saying is, from the mind's inner consciousness. By either school the subject, it is evident, is left precisely in the position in which it is found. Without, therefore, entangling myself in the meshes of any of these inquiries, I proceed to the task before me.

In casting a glance over the long vista of millennia unrolling before my eyes, I perceive distinctly four successive stages, at each of which we may conveniently halt, each of which being marked by characteristics which cannot easily be overlooked. We can, therefore, break the journey in which we are engaged on four points. The first portion of the journey extends from Moses the Law-giver to Ezra the scribe (460 B.C.). It is the period commencing with the inception of the idea which, working its way, travelling along the course

of centuries, grew and grew; and in growing shaped, developed, and modified itself until it became what we see it is. It is the handful of snow detached by a gust of wind, which rolls on and on, and as it rolls gathers to itself fresh masses until at last it reaches the valley as an immense avalanche. It is the period when everything is still in motion.

The second portion of the journey extends from Ezra to Rabbi Yochanan Ben Saccai, a contemporary of the destruction of the second Temple (70. C.E.), the youngest of the disciples of Hillel, the predecessor and teacher of the Gamaliel, at whose feet the apostle Paul sat. It is the period of consolidation and crystallization. It is the period when the Hebrew Scripture, still in a state of fluidity under Ezra, settled down, and having acquired solidity, was ready to the hands of the rabbis, fit to receive and retain the shape which they, in the course of several generations, gave it, and when the several schools of religious thought known by the names of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes came into existence.

The third period of the journey extends from Rabbi Yochanan Ben Saccai to Moses Mendelssohn, who died at Berlin in 1786. The long period thus embraced may be considered as that of struggle, martyrdom, and compulsory accommodation. Not that the preceding period was destitute of these characteristics, but that they had now become more distinct, decided, incisive, and overshadowing all others. When Judah's national power was broken, and the conqueror, disregarding its institutions and idiosyncracies, forced upon it laws springing from views diametrically opposed to those

cherished by the conquered, the absolute necessity of choosing arose—the conquered must either yield or perish. All means of resistance, whether of a physical or moral nature, having been exhausted, the latter alternative was preferred in the form of accommodations, originating in a welcome unconscious self-deception, productive of the belief that what was yielded was not a fortress but an unimportant piece of ground, or only a temporary surrender which would soon be regained, and for which, therefore, martyrdom need not be incurred. The principle of the survival of the fittest was once more exemplified in this struggle. Of the three schools of religious thought into which Judaism had become divided in the preceding period—the Samaritans formed a sect outside the synagogue—two now actually perished: Sadduceeism, on the one hand, which to use a parliamentary phrase formed the Right, rigidly as it interpreted certain institutions which, in the existing state of affairs, had become utterly untenable or meaningless, now lost every inch of ground, and consequently was for the time swallowed up by the abyss yawning at its feet, to re-appear, as will be seen, at a later period in a modified form under the name of Karaism, or Scripturalism; while Essenism, on the other, which may be considered as the Left, laying hold as it did on the opposite side of Judaism, refining upon its spiritual elements until losing itself in dreaminess, gradually melted away for want of a solid kernel, ultimately probably passing into those mystical schools which the rise and invigoration of Christianity called forth. Pharisaism alone, occupying the Centre, now transformed into Rabbinism, possessed enough of elasticity to

allow of a considerable strain without snapping asunder, and sufficient backbone to afford the necessary points of support.

The fourth and last portion of our journey is the shortest. It extends from the time of Mendelssohn to our days. But, brief as it is, it is pregnant with important phenomena. It is the period of re-awakening and consciousness. Its philosophical breath also passed over Judaism. Its professors, looking around, and perceiving the antagonism in which the inherited religious system stood in so many points to the majority of their fellow citizens, and the woful consequences which it brought on them, naturally asked themselves, For what do we exist, and why should we struggle and suffer? The different answers given to this question, and the practical solutions thereof attempted, form the religious and intellectual history of the Judaism of our days. With the delineation of this history, our journey will terminate. Until we reach this goal, I shall have to bespeak your patience and indulgence.

The first period, forming the subject of this lecture, begins, I said, with Moses, and terminates with Ezra. During this period, the chief constituents of the so-called Old Testament came into existence, and were cast into their present mould. The biblical canon, it is true, was closed at a much later period, and there is good reason to believe that additions were made a considerable time after Ezra's death (3). But there is hardly any doubt that the constituents substantially remained

unaltered. It is true that the several authors of these writings, as well as the persons introduced therein, do not always agree in their notions and views on some subjects occasionally very important to the religious world; and their ideas on these matters were as yet far from the fixity which they attained in subsequent ages. But this need not distract our view, and prevent our considering these writings as a whole, since it is as a whole that they presented themselves to the subsequent generations, and, as such, shaped their religious system, and gave it that form in which it has come down to us.

Regarded from this point of view, it will be perceived that the contents of the Pentateuch, and it is this book with which we are chiefly concerned, form three distinct groups—history, doctrines, and commands.

The historical portions, not coming within the scope of the immediate object before us, must, of course, be entirely disregarded. Nor shall I pay any attention to the conventional division of the contents of the Pentateuch, known by such names as ceremonial, dietary, or Levitical laws, or whatever these divisions may be; for, useful as they are to the student for the special purposes he may have in view, there is not a particle of evidence to show that the author of this volume ever considered its contents in this light, or mentally made any such distinction between law and law. He considered all laws equally binding, emanating as they did from the same authority. Thus so-called moral laws are dove-tailed with enactments regarded as purely ceremonial, or a so-called ceremonial law is wedged in between a number of moral precepts, and *vice versâ.* In fact, the order in which they are joined, and the

sequence in which they follow each other, show that the connecting links by which they were held together in the Legislator's mind were of a kind quite different from those to which they would have attached themselves had they been grouped according to our western notions; and by applying to them a standard of this nature we run the risk of failing to assign to them their proper value, and the true reasons for their enactment.

The only legitimate ground for dividing the contents of the Pentateuch, after subtracting its historical and poetical constituents, is that which separates them into doctrines or principles, which, of course, come purely within the province of ideas having their seat exclusively in the domain of the spirit to which alone they appeal, and by which alone they can be perceived and appreciated, and the portion which is intended to embody them; thus bringing them to the knowledge of the outer world. This portion of the contents of the Pentateuch—the outcome of the principles—I call, for brevity's sake, Institutions, whether they be symbols, rites, or ceremonies of a positive or a negative nature. This division is founded on a distinction which it can be shown was ever present to the mind of the Legislator, of which he never lost sight, and which is not rarely clearly enunciated by him.

More frequently, however, institutions are enacted without clear intimation of the principles which they are designed to embody. For instance, the so-called dietary or Levitical laws. In such cases the mind, for the discovery of the principles represented by them, has recourse to inferences drawn from general established views, hints, or analogies. It is a process to which the

mind is driven by parity of reasoning, since it cannot admit that, while one portion of the institutions enjoined rests upon clearly enunciated principles, another, proceeding from the same source, should consist of purely arbitrary orders, standing in no rational relation to any object aimed at. These principles may not show themselves to the inquirer at the first glance, even as the root bearing the stem of the tree burrows deep in the soil, or the foundation sustaining the superstructure is laid deep in the ground, but nevertheless of the existence of which the mind has not the remotest doubt.

On the other hand, it is noteworthy that several very important principles, borne testimony to by the whole of the religious system, are not distinctly affirmed in the Hebrew Scripture, and it is not easy to discover any institution representing them. Of this kind are several divine attributes, as will appear further on.

I now proceed to the consideration of these principles, or doctrines, to be followed by the enumeration of some of the institutions, practices, rites, or symbols, the special relation of which to one or more of the former will be pointed out. These principles bear on the Deity —his attributes, Creation, his relation to his creatures in general, and the rational ones in particular; the relation of those to one another, the object of creation, and, lastly, the means for its attainment. These principles accordingly lay down: That the Deity is to be conceived as self-existent, a strict unity, spiritual, most holy, infinitely good, supremely just, omnipotent, eternal, omniscient, most wise, spontaneous Creator of the universe, absolute master of all his creatures, without responsibility to any of them, who by his own free will

and in conformity with his infinite goodness and wisdom has been pleased to ordain the following relations between himself and them. They are in every respect in a direct manner to depend upon him, although, as a general rule, he may employ secondary agencies in their government; he owes them no other regard save such as may spring from his infinite goodness and wisdom; they are, in fact, in his hands as clay in those of the potter, and have no right to ask, Why hast thou shaped us into this or that vessel?

From his rational creatures formed after his image, into whose nostrils he blew the breath of life, and whom he endowed with free-will, he demands in addition complete obedience to his will in whatever way manifested —love to, fear of, and full confidence in him. They are further to acknowledge their complete and sole dependence upon him, and especially beware how they pay homage to any other being beside him, he being a jealous God. They are further to make themselves acquainted with his attributes, and imitate them as far as lies in their power. On the other hand, he undertakes to reward the obedient and punish the disobedient, reserving to himself time, place, and manner for the execution of his behests, which are often inscrutable.

These rational creatures he placed to the rest of the creation in the relation of stewards. They are allowed its usufruct, but not absolute control over it. They may subdue all living creatures in so far as their subjection may benefit them; but must not abuse their power over these irrational creatures, and must treat them with mercy, and respect those general laws laid down for the government of nature. Men,

among themselves, however, are equals, and should therefore respect one another's rights, and no other obedience than what is due to the laws enacted can be enforced. Nevertheless, in the family circle the husband and father is head ; woman, in her capacity as a wife, is man's recognised helpmate. The universe was created for God's glory, and, consequently, also for the happiness of its rational inhabitants.

The means through which this can be attained is voluntary obedience to the will of the Creator. In order to assist man in this task, a family especially adapted for the purpose was made the depository of this will, and particularly fitted for the preservation of the knowledge thereof throughout all generations in prosperity as well as adversity; and also for the performance of the duties of custodian. This family was that of Abraham, and, in order to fit it for the custodianship, special institutions were enjoined on this family, whereby it was placed in a special relation to the rest of mankind. Such is an outline of the first period, which, from the most prominent figure in it, we may call Mosaism. I now proceed to the consideration of the component parts of this outline.

The first principle taught by Mosaism was, I said, the self-existence and independence of a Supreme Being ; consequently the existence of a personal God.

It is evident that without this principle the existence of Judaism would be inconceivable. It is the foundation upon which the whole superstructure rests. Nevertheless, this existence is nowhere in the Pentateuch distinctly affirmed in the way in which some of the other attributes are. It is, of course, implied in every verse,

but not distinctly stated. It is proposed as a thing to which all agree, and about which there can be no doubt. The first passage in the Bible does not say "there is a God," but "in the beginning God created heaven and earth." The ten commandments—the most important portion of the Bible—does not commence with a declaration of the existence of the Deity, as might have been expected, but with the announcement, "I am the Lord, thy God, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt." We shall meet with similar instances further on, and they will be duly commented upon.

Nevertheless, this defect, if defect it be, is fully compensated for by a distinct announcement which may be considered as equivalent to such a solemn declaration, and which is of frequent occurrence in the Hebrew Scripture. This declaration is contained in the name by which the Supreme Being announces himself in the Hebrew Scripture, and by which he is usually called in it. This name is Jehovah, or as modern Biblical critics will have it, Jahveh. This name is derived from a verb meaning, to be, or to exist, and in the verbal form in which it occurs it takes to itself the additional meaning—the being whose existence is continuous. It is, therefore, expressive of pure existence, without beginning, and without end, without the admixture of any other idea which might in any other way qualify its signification. Whenever, therefore, we meet with a passage in Scripture where God speaks of himself as Jehovah, it is tantamount to the announcement of His existence, and whether this name belongs exclusively to Scripture, or is imported from another people or language whether it is radically connected with the Latin, Jovis(4)

or the name of some other foreign deity is immaterial to our purpose. For us it suffices to know that by the Jews this name was believed to have been exclusively revealed to them and to their minds, at least from the commencement of the second period, it fully conveyed the ideas which I have endeavoured to adumbrate, and as such contributed its share towards the formation of Judaism such as we now find it.

For the same reason we may entirely disregard the various opinions of theologians, as to whether Jehovah was not originally the name of a family, tribal, or national deity, who gradually, as the popular mind became enlarged, expanded his domain, shook off all purely material characteristics, assuming spiritually, intellectually, and morally, a higher and higher position, until he at last rose to that of the God of the universe. We might for argument's sake concede all this, and even allow that this name did not convey to all Biblical personages an equally exalted notion ; that at different periods and to different persons the notion varied while the name remained ; that, in this respect, we meet in the Hebrew Scripture with fluctuations, that in the mouths of some this name shone forth with extraordinary effulgence, and was endowed with every perfection, while presenting itself in the speech of others as restricted and obscured as though under a cloud ; and yet maintain with truth that the statement in question is not in the least affected thereby, since there can be no doubt that at the period referred to before, the name of Jehovah presented itself to the popular mind, vested with an awe, sublimity and mysteriousness which could only have proceeded from the people's full comprehension of the

exalted conception with which this name impressed their imaginations (5).

I have now to inquire whether there is any special institution in the Mosaic code designed by the Lawgiver to externise, if you will allow me to coin this expression, and to bring this conception to the general consciousness. Of these I discover two. One of them I do not hesitate to refer to this principle. But about the other I am not free from doubt. I allude to the golden plate which the high-priest had to wear on his forehead, and on which was written, "Holiness to the Lord" (Exod. xxviii., 36).

This inscription on an ornament worn by the highest representative of Jewish worship over a most prominent part of his body, the reputed seat of the highest and noblest mental faculties, was the public, constant, national confession of the independent, personal, self-existence of the Being whose highest servant he was. By this I do not mean to say that this inscription served no other purpose in addition. It did do so, as the context shows; and it may here be the place to observe that such is the case with a number of other Mosaic institutions which serve two or more purposes, and in addition subserve one, and even several others.

The other institution, which may with great probability, yet not with absolute certainty, be referred to this principle, is the he-goat (Levit. xvi. 7-10), which on the great day of atonement, the acme of the Jewish religious system on which God promised on certain conditions to manifest His highest prerogative—that of pardoning sin—was to be chosen by lot cast with great solemnity. On one of the two lots

was written "unto Jehovah," in contradistinction to that destined for Azazel, or for a "scapegoat" as rendered in the Anglican Version. The parallel between the two institutions is evident in both cases. The highest personage in the hierarchy acts the principal part, and in both cases the name Jehovah, and not some other name of the Deity, such as *Elohim or Shaddai* appears emphatically. My hesitation in referring this institution to the principle under discussion arises from the contrast in which Moses places in this passage Jehovah to Azazel, the meaning and significancy of this mysterious word not yet being satisfactory elucidated. Sufficient, however, is known to the Biblical critic to induce him to reject the rendering—scapegoat.

I now come to the consideration of the next principle—unity. This is a principle to which Judaism attaches the utmost importance. It takes unity in so strict a sense that there are theologians (see Maimonides' Moreh Nebuchim, part I., chapters 50 and 53) who will not admit of any enumeration of divine attributes; God and his attributes being identical, since any division between them, even if only made for the sake of convenience in discussion, must be considered as bordering upon the province of Polytheism (6).

Of the numerous passages in the Hebrew Scripture which bear on this principle, I content myself with quoting one which the Jew to this day regards as the sheet anchor of his religion, which he repeatedly recites in his daily prayers, and which is the last sound striking his ears or escaping his lips on his death-bed, even as it forms part and parcel of the devotional exercises which his infantile tongue is taught to utter. This passage

runs thus, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God the Lord is one." Important as this principle is, I can yet only trace one or two institutions, or rather symbols, which appear to me to have been designed to typify it. The establishment by direct divine sanction of only one sanctuary, and the strict prohibition of any other.

In the wilderness the Israelites had only one tabernacle, and, when in their own land, only one temple. The denunciation by the Biblical writers of the high places, or any other place for the performance of religious rites, save the divinely appointed sanctuary, are well known. The sanctuary of God was to be one, even as God was one.

I consider as another symbol of this unity the election of one single people—Israel—as the custodian of the divine code and its witness. This opinion, however, is not so much derived from an explicit Biblical statement as it is inferential. It had no direct influence on the formation of actual Judaism. On the other hand, the consciousness of this people that it, alone among the nations of the earth, was entrusted by the Deity with a special mission of the utmost importance to the human race, greatly contributed towards shaping the character of this nation into what it is, and gave rise to features which powerfully influenced its fate, and thus, indirectly, also its religion.

These features are a certain feeling of independence on the part of Israel in its bearing towards God, in consequence of which He, not rarely in the prayers offered up by Israel in the darkest hours of trouble, is reminded that His glory was bound up with its preservation, and that He could not allow it to succumb

without at the same time marring his own design; extraordinary fortitude in the endurance of calamities, threatening it with national extinction, which arose from the profound conviction that the Most High, for His own sake could not permit its entire destruction; and, lastly, a certain pride emanating from the consideration of the eminence to which it had been raised by God's special favour, and the contrast between the sublimity of its own theological notions and the meanness of those entertained even by the most advanced and most powerful populations surrounding it. This feeling was still more strengthened by the contrast between the purity of the code of morals enjoined on it, and the low ethical standard followed by even the most enlightened nations. This feeling has found its most explicit utterance in Biblical passages and in prayers, such as "Blessed art thou, Israel, who is like thee, a people saved by the Lord?" (Deut. xxxiii., 29), or, "Thou art one, and thy name is one, and who is like thy people Israel, an only nation on earth," (II. Sam. vii., 23).

While the first of these features raised Israel in self-respect, and helped to bring on the result which was the object of its prayers, the latter was the fertile source of great and abiding misfortunes to it; for it gave by this pride mortal offence to the other nations, which in number, wealth, civilisation, art, and even science, were superior to Israel; and, being unable to appreciate the source of this pride, they considered Israel as haughty, presumptuous, vain, silly, and repulsive, and therefore made it feel the full weight of their hatred. The conduct of these nations when Israel was in trouble, as well as the

writings of the ancients still extant, show, whenever they refer to Jews and Judaism, how little these were understood, and how great, widely-spread, and deeply-seated were prejudice and ill-feeling against the Jews (7). The sad consequence was that when, in process of time, Christianity was carried from the east and south to the west and north, the Teutonic and Sclavonian tribes—which it can be shown were originally free from any feeling of enmity towards the Jews had implanted in their hearts by the missionaries of the new faith, together with it the seed of that hatred to the Jew which gradually ripened into the persecutions, of which he has been the victim ever since the establishment of clerical dominion over the minds of the converts (8).

I now proceed to the consideration of the next principle—God's spirituality. It is true God nowhere announces himself as a pure spirit; but that he considered himself as such is clear, for, speaking of man's wickedness which led to the deluge, he was referred to as saying, "My spirit shall not strive in man for ever" (Gen. iii., 3). Again, the history of the creation informs us that "the spirit of God moved on the face of the water" (Ibid i., 2); and although the word rendered spirit may also mean air or wind, yet the verb connected with it shows that what the historian had in his mind was the other signification, viz., spirit. Further, Moses is introduced as addressing the Deity, "God, the God of the spirits of all flesh" (Numb. xvi., 22, xxvii., 16). This clearly shows that the Hebrew mind was capable of distinguishing between matter (here applied in a narrower sense to flesh) and spirit. There

are also numerous other passages implying a consciousness of this distinction in the Hebrew mind (9).

But by this I do not mean to say that the line of distinction between the two was always in the Hebrew mind of old so clearly drawn as it is in modern times. It may be that the epithets and actions ascribed to the Deity in the Bible, which are now explained as figures of speech and anthropomorphisms, were taken at different periods by some who employed them in their primary materialistic sense. It is admissible that until the appearance of the writings of Maimonides in the 12th century, who emphatically and laboriously impressed upon the Jewish mind the vital distinction between the two (Moreh Nebuch. part I., chap. xxxi.), there were considerable fluctuations on the subject in the Jewish mind, and even a large amount of haziness ; since an eminent rabbi and critic, a contemporary of Maimonides (10), censures the latter in strong language for the vehemence with which he condemned the view which allowed material epithets to be ascribed to the Deity ; while the cabalistical school, passing for orthodox, explains the act of creation to have consisted in a voluntary contraction of the Deity, thus leaving space for the universe and an emanation from His Being ultimately metamorphosed into our material world. But here again applies with great propriety what I said before when discussing the divine existence. This difference of view does not affect the question at all, since it is a fact that at the time when Judaism was being consolidated at the commencement of the second period, those who performed this task held notions on the spirituality of God as pure as those of the modern Rabbis.

I cannot discover any positive institution referring to this principle; but there is a negative one so solemnly, so emphatically, and so frequently enjoined, that the importance attached to it by the Lawgiver becomes evident. The second commandment, which forbids the production of any image for the purpose of worship, especially if taken in connection with v.v. 12 and 15 of Deut. ii., in which Israel is given to understand that no form or shape is to be ascribed to God, can only rest upon the assumption of the divine incorporeity. Indeed, the horror of idolatry which the whole of the Pentateuch, and the Scriptures in general, breathe, as well as the strict injunctions given for the destruction of all images representing deities, can only have their root in the apprehension lest Israel be by their toleration accustomed to form a material conception of God, invest him with human passions, and then indulge in the gratification of them in the idea, that that cannot be displeasing to him of which He himself set the example. The discussion of the dimensions which this institution in process of time assumed, what special antagonism it created between Judaism and Christianity, and what influence it exercised upon the æsthetical feelings of the former would lead me too far away from the immediate subject before us. Suffice it that, while Jews have excelled as musicians, composers, actors, and painters, comparatively few of this race have devoted themselves to the plastic art; and, of these few, hardly any have as yet attained a very high degree of eminence.

I now come to the consideration of the next principle—God's holiness. This is repeatedly proclaimed by the Deity in a direct manner. To several command-

ments enjoined in the Pentateuch is appended as a reason, "for I am holy," (Lev. xi, 44, 45 ; xix., 2 ; xx., 26). This holiness must evidently be taken in a sense much wider than that to which this term now applies. Its scope clearly includes conditions, actions, and objects, which, according to our ethical view, do not come within its range. In fact, some of these declared by the Lawgiver as clean or unclean, pure or impure, come within its province. Holiness, in this sense, not only includes the preference essential to the divine nature for ideas of a moral order, for everything calculated to raise, foster, and sustain ideas of this order, but also inherent displeasure at everything capable of disturbing that mental harmony, that equanimity and placidity of temper necessary for the unclouded perception of what is moral, and the strength requisite for following the line of conduct to which it might point. If, therefore, man wishes to be holy because his Maker is holy, it is not enough for him strictly to obey the law of morality; but he must, in addition, shun everything the contact with which might create disgust, and thereby disturb the evenness of temper necessary to enjoy contemplation of the ideal perfection to be aimed at. He must, moreover, eschew everything that might weaken if not endanger bodily health so necessary for successfully striving after the ideal, and thereby through the mysterious yet intimate connexion between body and soul, taint and mar, and perhaps derange, also, that fine organisation requisite for duly perceiving, appreciating and carrying out what is morally good and right. Much of what comes under the so-called dietary laws and Levitical purity seems to me to belong to this

province; for these injunctions are not rarely introduced or concluded with the phrase, "Ye shall be holy"; or the command to be holy is assigned as a reason for the injunction.

I need not point out what wide scope this principle has, and how many institutions refer to it. The ethical laws naturally come pre-eminently within its province.

The next divine attribute is infinite goodness. This principle is in a direct manner announced by God himself, in response to the wish of Moses to be favoured with the sight of the divine glory. We read: "And the Lord passed by before him and proclaimed; the Lord, the Lord God, merciful and gracious, long-suffering and abundant in goodness and truth—keeping mercy for thousands, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin—and that will by no means clear the guilty—visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children and upon the children's children unto the third and the fourth generation" (Levit. xxxii. 6-9). There are several other passages in the Hebrew Scripture of a similar tenor; But it is remarkable that all of them describe God as full of mercy; yet none of them represent it as boundless. Its limit is reached where the province of justice begins. Upon this mercy does not encroach. The Lawgiver never ceases to warn us against the fatal error, that divine goodness will ever be stretched so far as altogether to free the guilty from penalty, the just and unavoidable consequence of sin. He may, under certain conditions, receive the repentant sinner again into favour; but it would be against the attribute of justice were sin to be effaced without previous expiation. Mercy only so far preponderates over justice in that

the consequences of goodness are to extend infinitely wider than those of wickedness.

If those of the former are to reach the thousandth generation, those of the latter are to stop at the fourth. Nor can this penalty be paid by another save the transgressor. The idea of a vicarious atonement was abhorrent to the mind of the Lawgiver (11). There are numerous institutions which attach themselves directly to this principle. I will mention one by way of exemplification. "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn." These institutions have received a very large elaboration during the second period, and the special application of the principle underlying them, so far as they affect the relations of man to dumb animals, has been carried to a great length under the name of "Infliction of pain on living creatures." The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals has thus in the rules laid down for the purpose, been anticipated, thousands of years ago; and it is somewhat remarkable that, while the Rabbis—contemporaries of the authors of the New Testament—had so much to say in behalf of the brute creation, not an allusion to this subject is to be found in the writings referred to. Institutions of this kind, in conjunction with the preceding attribute, had a powerful influence in shaping Judaism and the Jewish character, notoriously averse to the shedding of blood, and cruelty in general. The Jews among themselves, with justice, characterise themselves as "the merciful children of merciful men."

The next principle is God's supreme justice. It is true He nowhere declares that he is *supremely* just, even as He makes the announcement that He is gracious or

holy; but it is clearly inferred from the repeated injunctions to practise justice, and from the special laws laid down for this purpose. Indeed, so essential a divine attribute is it considered by the Lawgiver, that the judge, in his capacity as a representative of the Deity, is called God, and, in Deut., xxxii. 4, we read "He is the rock, His work is perfect, for all his ways are judgment; a God of truth, and without iniquity; just and right is he." To this principle may be referred all laws laid down for the government of the commonwealth, and regulating the relations between man and man. So momentous was the practice of justice considered by the Lawgiver, that when we compare the degree of importance attached to the several virtues which form the basis of the Jewish polity, and shape the relation of man to man, we are driven to the conclusion that justice or righteousness, as the Anglican version calls it, outweighed every other. It is enjoined, "righteousness, righteousness shalt thou pursue" (Deut. xvi., 20). The repetition of the noun, as well as the deliberate selection of the verb, "pursue," clearly show how high the Lawgiver placed this virtue above every other; a similar phraseology never being employed when any other virtue is enjoined. The manner in which divine mercy controls and balances divine justice, and *vice versa*, is, of course, a mystery. But there are numerous texts to show that the doctrine of predestination neither offers a solution of this problem nor is supported by any dictum in the Hebrew Scripture. The correectness of the rendering in Exod. xxxiii., 19, "and I will be gracious to whom I will be gracious, and I will show mercy to whom I will show mercy," so often quoted in

justification of this doctrine, is more than doubtful. It may be translated "And I shall be gracious, to whom I shall be gracious, and I shall show mercy, to whom I shall show mercy," which removes all arbitrariness from God's conduct towards man.

Here we discover another feature distinguishing between Judaism and Christianity. While both religions agree in ascribing to the Deity the two attributes referred to, the elder religion subordinates mercy to justice, while the younger seems to lay more stress upon the former. Christian charity is constantly appealed to by the professors of the daughter religion; but we never hear of Christian justice; while on the other hand, the Jew, in order to point out the importance of charity, calls it by the name of Justice. When he is recommended by a co-religionist to give alms, he is addressed with the words, "give justice"; and this is quite in conformity and in the spirit of the two religious systems, for the Gospels cannot find language strong enough to enjoin charity on its followers even at the very cost of justice. Everybody will recollect the sermon on the Mount. No special importance is attached in the New Testament to the practice of justice, while, as has been shown, the Hebrew Scripture lays the greatest stress upon the exercise of this virtue.

The institutions betokening this principle are very numerous. I confine myself to the mention of one, "Ye shall have one ordinance, both for the stranger and for him that was born in the land" (Levit. xxiv., 22, Numb. ix., 14).

As the other divine attributes, whether distinctly

mentioned in the Hebrew Scripture or inferentially arrived at, have, with the exception of one, not been betokened by any special institution, there is no occasion to comment upon them. The exception to which I refer is the divine creative energy manifested in the universe called by Him into existence. His divine energy is clearly described in the first chapter of Genesis.

The same book also mentions the most important institution established in commemoration of this fact, and reiterated in the ten commandments, which is the Sabbath. To this institution Judaism attaches extraordinary importance, its disregard being viewed in the light of unbelief in the creation as the direct work of the Deity ; for whether it was produced by six distinct successive exertions of the divine creative energy, as narrated in Genesis, or, after the fiat had gone forth, was the gradual result of the law of development and evolution—in either case the work must be ascribed direct to the divine agency, and must have been accomplished long anterior to historical times. The completion of the divine conception was therefore worth commemorating, and the commemoration to be celebrated by its chief work, natural lord and master of the creation—man. Judaism therefore cannot but regret that the Apostle Paul should have ranked the Sabbath among the beggarly elements which he deemed himself justified in abolishing. Nor can its resuscitation in a subsequent age in the shape of the Lord's day diminish this regret, since neither in form nor in substance can it be considered an equivalent for the Sabbath of the Decalogue. The abolition of the Sabbath, and its

subsequent re-enactment for another day, has placed an abyss between the two religions, and I cannot see how it can be bridged over, since any concession in this respect on the part of the Jew would be tantamount to the renunciation of a principle which would shake the very foundation of his religion.

At the same time it is but right to mention that in the time of Paul, and by the Rabbis to this day, the Sabbath was considered as one of the institutions never intended to be binding upon the Gentiles. The apostle therefore, as a Pharisee of the Pharisees, may have been of opinion that by abolishing the Sabbath—at least so far as Gentile converts are concerned—he did not transgress the Decalogue.

I have now completed the picture which Judaism presents of its conception of the Deity, and come to the consideration of the several relations established by Him.

I have said that, as absolute and irresponsible master of the creation, He demands from his rational creatures, in virtue of their free will, acknowledgment of their absolute dependence on and their trust in, their awe, and their love of Him. This involves the duty of worship. We are thus led at once into the province of sacrificial service. According to the notions of the age, the offering of sacrifices, whether from the animal or vegetable kingdom, or both, was then deemed by the nations surrounding Israel as the most appropriate expression of worship. An elaborate system of sacrifices therefore, suited to the several occasions, and changing situations in life, was laid down. The offering of prayers, either accompanying that of sacrifices or

without them, was left to the instincts of human nature, or rather the impulses of the heart (12). How prayer was detached from sacrifice and was ultimately received by the synagogue as its legitimate substitute, will be shown in the sequel. For the present, suffice it to say that this institution does not originally seem to have formed part and parcel of the Mosaic system of religious worship; that, having been once admitted, it consistently led to the introduction of another institution—that of the so-called priesthood; that in the opinion of some of the later prophets and psalmists, it was rather tolerated than approved of by the Deity; that according to the views of some eminent rabbis in subsequent ages, and of many Jews in our days, it did not form an essential constituent of Judaism; and that these would regard as a retrogression any attempt at its restoration. This subject will be more fully discussed in the third period.

From this an easy reply may be deduced to be given to those who, in our days, appeal to this institution as a support to their sacrificial proclivities or, assumption of a sacrificial instinct in human nature.

That the law of Moses enjoins on man the imitation of the divine attributes cannot be doubted for a moment. Such phrases as "Noah walked with God" (Gen. vi., 9), or the command to Abraham, "Walk before me" (Ibid xvii., 3), or the general phrase, "walking in the way of the Lord," can rationally only be resolved into such phrases, as "Noah observed and followed the way in which God dealt with his creatures," *i.e.*, he had for his ideal the imitation of the divine attributes. More distinctly this is enunciated in the passage in which the Deity is quoted, as saying with respect to Abraham, "for

I have known him that he may command his children and house after him, that they may keep (or observe) the way of the Lord to do righteousness and justice" (Ibid xviii., 19). The repeated injunction diligently to study the law, greatly amplified and made emphatic by the rabbis had no other object than the imposition of the duty on men to make themselves thoroughly acquainted with the divine will as manifested in nature and in His will, so that they might know how to obey Him. To these injunctions we are mainly indebted for the preservation of this code, while the literature of other contemporary nations greater and mightier than Israel altogether perished. In what way the rabbis sought to impress this injunction upon the people, and to carry it out, and how it transformed Israel into a literary people to this day, cannot be discussed here.

It is a corollary flowing from the attribute of divine justice that the obedient should be rewarded and the disobedient punished. Indeed, rewards and punishments are frequently set forth in the law, both in general terms and detail. It has, however, often been asked how it is that all of them are of a temporary nature, and why has no reference been made to either to take place in after life? Some have thought that this silence justifies the conclusion that a future life was either not known, or not believed in by the Jewish Lawgiver, since, as they reason, it is impossible that he should have intentionally renounced the powerful hold on human conscience which belief in rewards and punishment in an invisible world affords to the moralist. They, moreover, say that they cannot discover any institution indicative of such belief, and therefore have

claimed the reception of this belief for another faith. As Judaism holds fast by this belief—as the rabbis regard it as one of the sheet-anchors of their religious system, have largely expatiated upon it, and introduced several rites expressive of this belief—it may not be out of place to dwell on it for a few moments.

I cannot admit the conclusions referred to. For the very existence of divine justice, from which follows the corollary that there must exist reward and punishment, cannot but be carried still further: since, as the experience of every day shows, they do not always follow the conduct of man while the opportunity of observing him or his descendants is enjoyed; these necessary consequences must overtake him at a time when he is withdrawn from the sight of every living being, *i.e.* hereafter, or what we call the world to come. The soul, therefore, must survive the body which has decayed in death. But were Moses, and the generation to which he gave the laws which go by his name, really strangers to the doctrine of the continued existence of the soul after its separation from the body through death, *i.e.* the immortality of the soul?

In the first place, it is now established beyond all doubt that the doctrine was a fundamental principle in the religion of the Egyptians at least as early as the time of Moses, and could, therefore, not have been unknown to Israel after a sojourn of four centuries among them; and still less to Moses—brought up as he was at the royal court (13). Then, again, is it true that there are in the Pentateuch no references to the immortality of the soul? Without dwelling upon any of the allusions and figures of speech which can only have a sense when we

consider them in connexion with this doctrine, I will confine myself to those passages which as plainly presuppose a belief in this principle as though it had been proclaimed by Moses in as many distinct words (14). It must further be borne in mind that besides this there are other important principles of Judaism, as shown before, which are nowhere clearly enunciated, but rest entirely on inferences, which, forming a kind of undesigned evidence, carry in the eyes of enlightened critics at least as much weight as direct testimony.

The first of these passages is that in which the Israelites are forbidden to enquire of the dead (Deut. xviii. xi.). Now, whatever the Lawgiver himself may have thought of necromancy, it is clear there would have been no occasion for this prohibition had there not been among the people the belief that something which does not become extinct at the death of a person may be communicated with. Indeed, the severe laws enacted against necromancers show how widely diffused and how deeply rooted this belief must have been in the public mind. Balaam, the magician, being against his will constrained to bless the people which he had been called to curse, expresses the wish: "Oh that my latter end (or rather my hereafter), should be like his," *i.e.*, "Israel's" (Numb. xxvii., 11). This, if it means anything, means that Balaam, seeing the special divine protection enjoyed by this people, expresses the wish that hereafter he might be allowed to share the happiness in store for God's favourites. Lastly, when in Gen. ix. the shedding of human blood is forbidden, God said to Noah "your blood I will require of your souls" (v. 5). Here the soul is made responsible for the shedding of blood

as something quite distinct from the temporal punishment decreed against the shedder of blood, and announced in the following verse. I need hardly add that several of the other books of the Hebrew Scripture contain passages which in distinct language express belief in the immortality of the soul.

Nor are there institutions wanting betokening this doctrine. When we read, " ye are children of the Lord your God, ye shall not cut yourselves, nor make any baldness between your eyes for the dead " (Deut. xiv., 1), what else can this mean but since the Israelites standing to God in the close relation of children to a parent, consequently partake of his nature, and therefore cannot perish like the beast of the field. Those savage marks of mourning, therefore, after the loss of a member of the family, to which others resort in their despair, do not become those who are sure that the separation by death is not a separation for ever. Either this is the logical connexion between the first part of the phrase (protasis), and the last (apodosis), or there is none whatever.

But then the question still remains, why was the doctrine of reward and punishment hereafter not laid down as one of the leading principles by Moses, as was done by the authors of the daughter religions, viz., Christianity and Mahometanism, and by other creeds both of ancient and modern times ? The reply to this question I find in the sad effects which this doctrine produced among the Egyptians, and which could not have escaped the observant eye of so clear-sighted a Lawgiver as Moses was. It is well known that this doctrine was one of the principal tenets, if not the leading

tenet of the religion of the ancient Egyptians of the time. The practice of embalming the dead, and thus preserving the bodies from decay, had its origin in the expectation that the surviving soul would in due time return to tenant the body—its former seat. The belief in a court of justice, to which, in the opinion of the same Egyptians, the souls of the departed had to submit, and which gave rise to a similar fable among the Greeks of old, shows what powerful hold this tenet had laid on their minds, and to what degree of development it had attained. It is but natural that those believing in this tenet should have striven with all their might to render these dread judges propitious to them, should have made every sacrifice to conciliate their favour, and thus afforded opportunities to the priests, the sole interpreters of the will of the gods, the powerful intercessors between them and man for multiplying superstitious practices, obtaining full dominion over the general population, and, thus working upon its fears ; should have extorted from individuals—especially when on their death-bed, and consequently no longer capable of enjoying any worldly good —such gifts and such dispositions of property as enriched the caste of the mediators, but robbed the families of the departed and impoverished the State. Egyptologists have discovered in their researches abundant traces of such practices, and everybody has heard of the privileges, wealth, power and influence enjoyed by the priestly caste in ancient Egypt (15). Moreover, had Moses established his system upon the principles of rewards and punishments hereafter, great pre-eminence must have been thereby given to the spiritual over the secular interests. The consequence must have been

that the priesthood charged with watching over man's spiritual concerns would have claimed pre-eminence over the secular authorities, inasmuch as the spirit ranks infinitely higher than matter, and the soul is intended to live for ever, while the body is doomed to a speedy decay.

Something analogous took place at a later period, when the Christian clergy, laying hold of the same doctrine made so prominent in the new religion, fostered, expanded, and developed it until in its hands it became one of the most powerful instruments for ruling the faithful. To this doctrine Christianity in a great measure owes the transformation of Hades into purgatory, with all the consequences flowing from the belief in the power of the priest to abridge or mitigate its tortures, if not to release from them altogether. It is well known that in several countries laws had to be passed to protect the survivors as well as the State, from the rapacity of the priests. In our own country the law of mortmain exists to this day. The fierce struggle between the Ultramontanes and the Government in Germany could never have arisen had the belief not been fostered that it is in the power of the priest to loosen and to bind for ever.

A priesthood having been instituted in Israel, had this doctrine been made too conspicuous, the same evils would have sprung up which the Lawgiver must have witnessed in Egypt, and which we in our own days witness in Roman Catholicism. But Israel's priests were to be the servants, not the masters of the people; and were to inculcate the law of God, not superstitious practices. This doctrine, therefore, although

acknowledged, was not to be made too prominent. Instead of this, rewards and punishments of a temporal nature were announced, and, as the consequences of a man's conduct do not always manifest themselves in his lifetime, they were extended to his posterity ; limited, if presenting themselves in the shape of punishment, to the fourth generation, but if in that of reward extended to the thousandth generation ; thus at the same time exemplifying the infinite preponderance of God's forbearance over his anger. It is possible that by the clause, "unto those that hate me," appended to the threat of punishment, and by that, "to those that love me and observe my commandments," added to the promise of reward, reference is made to that extraordinary physical and physiological phenomenon designated by the name of atavism.

After this somewhat lengthy digression, I return to the subject before us. In what relation did the Deity place man to the brute and inanimate creation? Here applies a remark which I have made repeatedly. This relation is nowhere clearly enunciated ; but we, nevertheless, have a distinct knowledge thereof. It is abundantly supplied by inferences, and by incidental testimony, and therefore carries with it all the weight of undesigned evidence.

Man was clearly intended to be the steward, but not the absolute master of the creation. He was to be allowed its usufruct, but not to have absolute dominion. He has, therefore, to respect the nature of his subjects, and avoid doing violence to the instincts implanted in them, and the laws governing them. Man, therefore, should not mix two different kinds of seed

and sow them in this condition; for as each in its growth and development follows different laws, these must necessarily come into conflict, check each other, and one of the plants, if not both, must be stunted, and be deprived of a portion of the nourishment due to it. This prohibition was even extended to the use of any fabric composed of animal and vegetable products, intended to express the divine horror of mixtures of this kind (Levit. xix, 19). After this it is scarcely necessary to dwell upon the law forbidding the mutilation of animals, thus preventing the exercise of certain natural functions; for this reason also, the killing of animals in order to use their flesh as food, required a special divine license (Gen. ix, 3). There the attribute of divine goodness meets and blends with the relation under discussion. Man was not to muzzle the mouth of the beast while treading out the corn (Deut. xxv, 4); was to assist in unloading it when seeing it crouching under its burden (Exod. xxiii, 5), and give it complete rest on the Sabbath day (Ibid. xx, 10). Judaism, therefore, is decidedly opposed to those fashionable sports and pastimes, which, inflicting tortures upon an animal, do not in any way materially benefit either the torturer or any other human being.

But among themselves all men, of whatever race and creed, were to be equal, loving one another (Levit. lxx, 18), the law being common to them all. For this there is a distinct declaration. Moses, in the name of the Deity, solemnly declared, "One law and one manner shall be for youand the stranger that sojourneth with you" (Numbers xv, 16). Judaism, therefore, politically and civilly, with one exception, knows of no alien law(16).

This exception is the prohibition to elect a foreigner as a King (Deut. xvii, 15). But where a whole alien population had placed itself by its conduct beyond the application of this law, and given occasion for war, no greater amount of coercion was to be employed than was necessary for the attainment of the desired object. A city to be beseiged, had previously to be summoned to surrender. The wanton destruction of fruit trees (Deut. xx, 19), the consequence of which would have been felt long after the war was over, was strictly forbidden; and although the opposing warriors—then co-extensive with the adult population—might, in accordance with the usages of the age, be put to death, yet the women and children had to be spared, and it was especially over the former that the law threw its mantle of protection; for no brutal violence was to be offered to a female captive (Ibid. xxi, 10-14). No doubt certain populations were excepted from the application of these laws of mercy for reasons repeatedly stated by Moses, evidently by way of apology (Ibid. xx, 18); but in the war with these, the Israelites considered themselves as blind instruments carrying out the distinct behests of Him to whom they were taught they owed implicit obedience, whose orders they had no right to question, and who owed no responsibility and no duty to any of his creatures, in whose hands they were as the clay in that of the potter; and which was quite exceptional, and, therefore, could never be appealed to as a precedent (17).

To this perfect equality there were only two exceptions. The first was formed by the slaves. The abolition of slavery in the existing social state could not have been accomplished without giving rise to evils much

greater than itself. The legitimate sources of slavery, then, were three: physical misery, crime, and war.

In the loose state of social organisation then prevailing, when an individual fell into distress through unforseen circumstances beyond his control, such, for instance, as famine, flood, or war, he very often had no other means of preserving his life, the lives of his children, or obtaining the necessary protection, than to enter the service of some wealthy person who could give him food and aid; and if this person was unwilling to accept his services, or maintain his young children on any terms save slavery, the petitioner had no choice but to submit (Deut. xv, 12). For the law to interfere would have been to render his and their fate still worse, since they would thereby have been deprived, without compensation, of what he must have considered a boon.

The second source of slavery was crime (Exod. xxii, 2). If an individual committed a theft, or otherwise caused his neighbour a pecuniary loss, such, for instance, as the contracting of a debt which was not repaid, the courts of law had the right to sell the criminal into slavery, in order to indemnify with the proceeds the injured person for the loss inflicted. Of course this process was only resorted to when the thief or debtor did not possess sufficient to make good the loss, and, in addition, in the case of a thief, to pay the penalty imposed by the law.

But the most fertile source of slavery undoubtedly was war. When a country, perhaps after a protracted and sanguinary war, was subdued, the question naturally arose among the victors how the new conquest was to be preserved. It may be easily conceded that while

the fury excited by the battle lasted, the massacre of the whole adult male population, which in those days constituted the army, was resorted to. But, if time were allowed for reflection, and as humanity dawned upon mankind, aversion to such a measure must have been felt. But, as the fruits of the victory could not be relinquished, ingenuity was set at work, and other expedients for attaining the object were contrived. The captives were either transported to another region, which did not offer the means for renewed resistance, or they were carried into slavery. The first expedient was not always practicable; in order to be available, the conqueror must have waste lands for the exiles to settle upon. Lengthy preparations must be made for their reception, and they must be enabled to provide themselves with all the necessaries for their tedious and arduous tramp (Ezekiel xii, 3 and 7). Such an enforced emigration, moreover, must have entailed hardships upon the exiles to which large numbers must have fallen victims, and could, after all, for a long time not have been of much use to their conquerors. We know, from the history of the kingdoms of Israel and Judah, that such was the fate of their inhabitants after they had succumbed to the armies of the Assyrians and the Chaldeans. Reduction into slavery, however, was a much simpler and a much more expeditious mode of insuring the submission of the new conquest. Deprived of the adult male population, or, at least, of those who carry arms, the defenceless remnant was naturally unable to offer any further resistance. This expedient, had, moreover, the advantage for the conquerors that the enforced labour of the slaves became at once an

abundant source of profit and enjoyment to the masters. The reduction of the prisoners into slavery, therefore, instead of massacring them, must be considered as a large stride in advance in the path of humanity, deserving the encouragement of the philanthropists of the age. Had, therefore, slavery been prohibited before a better state of organisation and a higher civilisation offered other means to the conqueror for the attainment of his object, there was ground to fear that the former cruel practice would have been revived. Slavery, therefore, as an institution, had to be tolerated. But it could be mitigated, and a certain amount of protection given to the slave's life and limbs. This is what the law did. The Sabbath rest was secured to the slaves; his murderer, even if his master, was to be punished with death (Exod. xxi, 20), and if hurt in any of his limbs, liberty was to repay him for the injury sustained (Ibid. 26). Nor was a slave who escaped from the cruelty of his master to be delivered over to the vengeance of his owner (Deut. xxiii, 16). Kidnapping, which in our days is such a fertile source of slavery, was forbidden under the severest penalties. Death was the doom of the kidnapper (Exod. xxi, 16).

The second exception was woman. Politically, civilly, and socially, woman was man's equal; at least we find no legal disability attaching to woman. But in the domestic circle, since it was absolutely necessary that in the case of a difference of opinion between husband and wife, the power finally to decide must have been vested in one of the two, man was appointed to be the head of the family. In marriage, too, the power of dissolving the tie was vested in the man

(Deut. xxii, 1) (18). This, however, did not disturb the equality between the two; for as a breach of the marriage vow, according to the interpretation given to the law, was the only sufficient reason for its dissolution, the few exceptions do not affect the question. There was little chance of a husband being found guilty of this crime in a state of society which considered polygamy as legal.

Nor could the inability of a daughter to share in the paternal inheritance with the sons be regarded as a disturbance of this equality. For this participation could not have been allowed by the law without bringing on, from time to time, a collision with a fundamental principle of the Commonwealth which forbade the alienation of landed property from the family to which it belonged, or restricting women to marriages within the circle of their own kindred. The first was an inconvenience which could, and was, in practice, remedied. The second would, in every respect, have been an unmitigated evil. The remedy, in practice, applied was the duty of the father, or, in the case of his death, of the brothers, to support the single daughter and sister, and, if she were married, of the husband to provide for her (19). The solicitude of the law for a married woman went in this respect so far as to transfer this duty to the eldest surviving brother if the husband should have died childless (Deut. xxi, 8). Marriage portions at the time, as a rule, were not given; on the contrary, it was the bridegroom who had to give to the father a sum of money, probably as a compensation for the loss of the services of the daughter.

That the object of creation is God's glory, and consequently man's happiness, is nowhere distinctly stated

in the Pentateuch. The former, however, is referred to by one of the prophets (Isaiah, xliii., 7), and the latter may be deduced from the subjection of the brute creation to man, which cannot be accounted for on any other ground; and passages such as, "do this or that, that it may be well with thee" (Deut. iv, 40), are not rare in the Pentateuch.

That this object can be attained only through man's voluntary submission to the divine will is, however, distinctly declared; for in Deut. xxx, 15-19, we read of the blessings and curses, good and evil, laid before Israel, followed by the injunction, "and thou shalt choose the good," &c. But how was the divine will to be ascertained? This could only have been accomplished by so shaping the human mind that it should have instinctively and unerringly perceived the divine attributes, and the principles which I have endeavoured to develop from the Pentateuch. But such a constitution of the mind would clearly have been incompatible with those general laws which divine wisdom saw fit to lay down for the regulation of man's intellectual nature. Or it might have been effected by a distinct communication of His will to every generation—nay, to every individual of the generation; in fact, by a continual external revelation. But this would undoubtedly have required an order and harmony of the laws of nature quite different from those established. True, this revelation might have been internal; a gradual development in the human mind of our knowledge of the divine will. But this process must from its nature have been exceedingly slow, fluctuating and uncertain, little satisfying the mighty yearnings of the heart, in

this matter, above all, longing for certainty; and it would hardly have been reconcilable with divine goodness to leave man in this respect to scanty and faint rays to guide him in the utter darkness around. There only, therefore, remained a *tertium medium*, and this divine wisdom resorted to. A family suitable for the purpose was selected, and especially fitted by a concurrence of providentially arranged circumstances, vicissitudes and events for the task it was to fulfil. The name and history of this family, which in time grew into a people, is well known. To this people the divine will was communicated once and for all. This people was constituted custodian of the deposit entrusted to it.

But if it was to be enabled to discharge the special duties of a custodian, and to resist the several powerful influences, the natural tendency of which was to efface, or at least to obscure, in his mind the consciousness of this task, weaken his will to discharge it, and to disintegrate and decompose his mental constituents, special provisions had to be made, and special precautions to be taken. Additional duties respecting the knowledge of the divine will had, therefore, to be imposed on him in his capacity as custodian. This gave rise to a series of enactments only binding upon Israel, some of them closely connected with the providential events which were intended to fit him for his special vocation; others were designed to ward off the danger of disintegration; and others, again, the object of which was profoundly to impress this people with the sense of its special destiny. By way of exemplification of the first class, I name the Passover, with all its concomitant rites; of the second, many of the so-called dietary laws; and

of the third, the wearing of fringes on the four corners of the garment, the sight of which was to call to mind the divine code (Numbers xv, 38-40). From this special charge there sprang special relations between this people and the rest of mankind, and between the several individuals composing this people.

The problem, if I am allowed to say so, which divine wisdom in this respect had to solve was, on the one hand, to endow the people with an organisation compact enough to obstruct the insinuation of the corruption and superstitions of the surrounding masses, which yet, on the other, should be sufficiently loose and elastic to admit of the invigorating contact with strangers, to whom thus an opportunity should be afforded of becoming acquainted with the special deposit entrusted to Israel's custody for the common welfare ; further, to give this nation, on the one hand, stability and strength enough to resist any violent attack on its possessions and constitution, and, on the other, to entail upon it such a degree of disability as to prevent its using its strength for spreading its tenets by violence. For this purpose a special territory was assigned to it, as it were, on the highway between the most powerful and civilised nations of antiquity—Egypt and Assyria—and easily accessible to others, such as Greece and Rome. At the same time Israel was to be kept clear of the seductive examples of vice, crime, and even error, by which the original possessors of the land, had they been allowed to remain, would have endangered it ; while the foreigner was to be attracted by the extension of the equality of law to him. Again, while the people was thus enabled to defend its native mountains, holding its

own against invaders, its rulers were forbidden either to keep a large number of horses, or to accumulate a vast treasure, and thus effectually prevented from keeping a standing army, or sweeping over the plains of the neighbouring countries in large masses of cavalry. Lastly, the peculiarity of the national institutions must have served powerfully to excite the attention of other nations, and thus enabled it to discharge its missionary office much more efficiently than by going forth and preaching to them.

As children and servants of God, in a much stricter sense than the rest of mankind, and knitted more closely together by their special duties, the equality before the law was, so far as practicable, also to be extended to their external relations with one another. The landed property of the single families—and among a purely agricultural people land forms the principal possession—was not to be alienated for good (Levit. xxv. 10). Individuals thereof were not to enslave one another (Exod. xxi. 2), and loans were to be granted to one another, as becomes brethren, without interest (Deut. xxii. 20, 21), not usury, as erroneously rendered in the Anglican version. These principles, among others, are betokened by the institutions of the release year (Deut. xv. 2) and jubilee (Lev. xxv. 11), with their concomitant ordinances.

It will be observed that, although an external objective revelation is assumed all throughout the Hebrew Scripture, and that, indeed, the Deity is repeatedly introduced as addressing Biblical personages, yet the limits of revelation are nowhere traced, and nowhere is it stated what elements in the Bible are

divine and which are human, and that there is not a single institution of which it can be said that it was established for the purpose of betokening this stupendous event. This gap, if gap it be, has at later periods been filled by the rabbis ; the Feast of Weeks having been by them especially connected with the giving of the decalogue on Mount Sinai (20).

The special relation in which Israel was thereby placed to the rest of mankind has been incidentally referred to in the course of the preceding remarks. It may, however, be useful to group them together, so that they may be conveniently taken in by the mind.

The stranger, when coming to sojourn in the land of Israel, was to enjoy all the civil and political rights of the native. He was, however, while staying there, to abstain, in public, from idolatry, and from outraging any of those moral laws, known as the Noachidæ laws, which will be enumerated hereafter. His obedience was to be quite of a negative character. No test, and no oath of abjuration was forced on him, and no promise was extorted from him. He had simply to obey the law of the land in return for the rights and protection which this law secured to him in common with the native. Beyond his native land, the Israelite was not bound to seek to extend his religious influence. The slight hint given by Moses about Israel's missionary duties was, however, taken up by the prophets, especially Isaiah and Zachariah, and some of the psalmists ; and, expanded by them. Israel was, morally and religiously, to become a model people, and thus attract the attention of the other nations, and convert them, not by violence or decep-

tion, but by the force of example and the sublimity and purity of its doctrines.

I have now brought the first part of my task to a close, and proceed to the consideration of the second period.

PERIOD II.

From Ezra (460 B.C.) to the Destruction of the Temple (670 C.E.).

The period just discussed has exhibited to us the Mosaic religious system still in the condition of fluidity. The principles, it is true, were fully developed at the close of the period. But the institutions betokening them, if already in existence, had been practised only partially on rare occasions, and some of them not at all. We stood, as it were, at their cradle, and their growth and maturity falls within this period. The five books of Moses began to be considered as the national palladium, and gradually the other relics of the national literature, saved from the wreck after the destruction of the first temple, were added and illumined by the halo which popular veneration shed over the ancestral inheritance. Although the canon was not closed till long after Ezra (Zunz Gottesdienst. Vortræg. chap. ii., p. 34), yet the greater part of the Hebrew Scripture was in all probability then already in existence, and generations must have passed before they were arranged, and had risen so high in popular estimation, in consequence of the idea of a peculiar sacredness attaching to them, as not to allow of a fresh addition. Indeed, it can be shown that formal exclusions of any part from the canon would have met with less popular resistance, if at all, than the attempt at

enlarging it (21). It may be assumed that up to the time of the Maccabees, the religious zeal of the successors of the prophets, and of the restorers of the new Jewish polity, popularly termed "the men of the great synagogue" (see Buxtorfs' Tiberias), expended itself in searching for those relics, emendating and arranging them. Stock, as it were, had to be taken before an estimate could be formed of the spiritual wealth possessed. Simultaneously with this labour a beginning was made with the carrying out of the institutions of the law.

This beginning was, as it necessarily must have been for a time, quite tentative, since experience of the manner of executing many of them was wanting. This will become clear when it is considered that the Babylonian exile formed a break in the continuity of the national existence, during which none of the laws connected with the possession of Canaan and the temple-worship could be carried out; and these were the most numerous even as they comprised the most important institutions. But, even while the temple stood, gaps in this respect occurred. Thus, of the high festivals we know for certain that they were not generally kept (Nehem. vii. 17; 2 Kings, xxiii. 22). Of the observance of the great day of Atonement or of the Feast of Weeks during the first period, there is not a trace. The Sabbath could not have been kept with the rigour prescribed in the decalogue, as may be inferred from 2 Kings, iv. 23. There is evidence to show that the law commanding the liberation of the Hebrew slaves, in the seventh year, was observed very imperfectly, and only exceptionally (Jeremiah, xxxiv., 8-16). Nor can it be shown that either the Sabbatical

year or the jubilee was kept during this period (Lev. xxvi. 34-35). Nay, King David, so justly extolled for his piety, had an officer at his court—Uriah the Hittite —(II. Sam. xi. 3-6) of Canaanitish origin, despite the express command of Moses not to tolerate any of the aboriginal inhabitants in the country (Deut. xx. 16-17). The same monarch, disregarding the laws for the transmission of landed property prescribed in the law, deprived the lawful owner of a portion of his possessions and gave them to a stranger (II. Sam. xix. 30) ; and, on another occasion, decreed the penalty of death against an individual who, according to the Pentateuch, was not guilty thereof (II. Sam., xii. 5). Nor do we find that he incurred for such conduct the censure of any of the prophets at his court. Of his sons, we read that they were *cohanim* (II. Sam. viii., 18), which, literally and generally, means priests, although, as is contended by some commentators in the passage referred to, the word *cohanim* should be rendered "officers." Samuel, a Levite, not a priest, offered a sacrifice in person (I. Sam. vii. 9). The line of high priests was shifted from the elder to the younger, and again back to the elder branch (I. Sam. xxii., 21; I. Kings ii., 35). Elijah offered sacrifices out of the temple (I. Kings, xviii., 33, 38) against the prescription of the law (Deut. xii., 13, 14). Jeremiah was of opinion that God had not enjoined the sacrificial service (Jerem. vii., 22), and Ezekiel seems to have understood certain laws of the Pentateuch different from the sense in which they are now received (xlvii., 22 ; xliv., 21, 22). These references will suffice to show that, although the Pentateuch may have been known, and even generally read, yet it had

not acquired, during the first period, such a firm hold on the popular mind as to create a restraining public opinion. When, therefore—in conformity with the new religious spirit aroused among the people during the Babylonian captivity—the desire awoke to carry out in their entirety the institutions prescribed in the law, difficulties arose, and doubts were awakened in the execution of the details which, for the reasons stated, it was not easy to remove. What if the first day of Passover fell on a Sabbath? were the operations necessary for the preparation of the paschal lamb, which had to be performed on the evening of Friday, to be considered as a desecration of the Sabbath (Bab. and Jerus. Talmud treat. Pesach. f. 66, A)? What kind of labour performed on the Sabbath rendered the worker liable to the penalty of death? (Mishnah Sabbath, the whole of chapter VII). A calendar not having been fixed by Moses, what was the right time for the celebration of the festivals as enjoined in the law (Lev. xxiii., 4)? Another instance: What was to be done if circumcision on the eighth day would have endangered the life of an infant? Questions of this nature must have presented themselves to the observant at the execution of every law, since the details are but rarely added, while the necessity of their being strictly carried out in all particulars is emphatically enjoined.

Some of these details might, no doubt, be ascertained from tradition. Tradition, therefore, had to be searched for, collected, and sifted (22). Others might be inferred with tolerable certainty from a careful analysis of the passages treating of the institution, and from their proper collation. This labour, therefore, had to be

performed. In other cases, where no aid could be derived from these sources, recourse had to be had to analogies and conjectures, or rules laid down for the interpretation of unexplained prescriptions (Middoth) (23)—satisfied if an allusion, however remote, or an interpretation, however forced, could be pressed into the service. Here was work enough for the zeal, learning, and ingenuity of the devout; and here we perceive the germs of those regulations which, systematised and recorded after having received in the course of ages many accretions, became known as the traditional or second law (deuterosis), and, in process of time, was ranked side by side with the original—called written law by way of distinction. All this necessitated the formation of the order of scribes, which acted such a prominent part in the history of their people, and which, properly speaking, had already commenced with Ezra, surnamed the Scribe (Ezra, vii., 6).

An event now occurred which gave a special impetus to the development of this traditional law, and greatly endeared it to the people; while, at the same time, enabling the nation to carry out the institutions of the law, without let or hindrance, to the widest extent possible. This event was the rising of the people against the Syro-Grecian power which, under Antiochus Epiphanes, sought to coerce the subject Jewish nation into religious conformity with the surrounding heathen populations. In this attempt the pagan Prince was not unsupported by an influential party among the governing classes of the people.

While Judea was under the dominion of Persia there were between the two peoples more points of agreement

than of difference. There is no reason to suppose that in civilisation the latter was in advance of the former, while in religion there were several points of friendly contact. The established religion of Persia then was a species of monotheism. It could not be any material difference to the two nations whether the supreme being was called Ormuzd or Jehovah ; while Ahrimon, or the principle of Evil, in constant antagonism to the principle of good (Döllinger's "The Gentile and the Jew, &c." vol. I, II Persia, etc., p. 389), might among the Jews well be personified by Satan, whose character was so vividly depicted in the introductory chapter to the book of Job, now part of the canon ; moreover, the Devs and Izeds might, in the popular imagination, easily coincide with the demons, or evil—or, rather, lying—spirits (I. Kings xxi., 22), and the angels. Persian influence, therefore, although not entirely lost upon the Jewish religious system, as will be shown further on, did not necessarily clash with the religion of the subject nation. But when the Persian power had been overthrown by the Macedonian hero, and Judea passed alternately under the dominion of the Syro-Grecians and Egypto-Grecians, the relations of the Jews to the new masters altogether changed.

For the first time the Jews came into abiding contact with a superior civilisation, a state of refinement and luxury, a legislation, a religion, and morals hitherto unknown to them, and in many points antagonistic. They thus became exposed to influences most incisive and disintegrating in their nature. Their mettle was as it were for the first time proved in the furnace of an extraordinary temptation. Will they pass through it

unscathed? Will they be able to stand the crucial test? It would have been a miracle had this contact remained without effect. It produced its effect. A section of the people belonging to the aristocracy was powerfully attracted by the new vista of life unrolled before their dazzled eyes, and the sensual enjoyment presented to them. They longed to be at one with their masters, and to step out from what appeared to them as the narrow circle of ancestral ideas—the close atmosphere of obsolete and uncouth habits and customs—into the boundless realm of spiritual freedom and physical license; and, with the impetuosity of new converts, endeavoured to drag the nation along with them. It was this party which, led on by some members of the family of the high-priest, abetted and assisted the Syrian masters in the attempt to overturn the altar of Jehovah and to replace it by that of Zeus, as narrated by Josephus and others. But this violence produced its natural reaction. It roused the indignation of the conservatives to an extraordinary degree, fanning the flame of zeal into an enthusiasm, the ardour of which has rarely been equalled in history. And when the national party at last conquered and extorted the recognition of national independence from the enemy, and seated upon the newly erected throne the dynasty whose sacrifices, devotion, and heroism had principally contributed towards the achievement of this triumph, a process of religious purification and rigourism set in which, more than any other event, helped on that consolidation of the ancestral institutions which mainly gave them their present shape and consistency. We are distinctly told that all those rites, the practice of

which the persecutors punished with a special ferocity, were those to which the liberated people clung with the greatest affection and tenacity. These rites became a religious shibboleth, and were as such doubly endeared to the people, and consequently a prominence was given them in the religious system which they would not have obtained but for this persecution. These rites were naturally such as characterised Jewish outward appearance, *i.e.* ceremonies, and thus had an extraordinary importance allotted to them. It may be assumed that, ever since, these ceremonies have received an amount of attention and minute elaboration which have extended throughout all generations to our own days (24).

About this time we meet with a high court, regularly constituted supreme in religious and civil matters, to whose verdicts even the kings had to bow, thus opening a new and important epoch in Jewish history. This high court—Synhedrion was its name—became the seat and guardian of all ancient traditions, interpretations, and decisions, to which it imparted coherence, system and authority. To it was applied the passage in Deut. xvii., from 8 to 13, in which Israel was enjoined to refer every matter in dispute, too hard for the inferior courts, to the priest or judge for the time being, and to abide by his decision whatever it might be. The Mosaic institutions had now for their full development their legal basis. This court, animated by the spirit of the Lawgiver, did not hesitate to modify, and even to set aside for the time being, institutions which no longer answered their purpose, and it may be said that, in this respect, the court trod in the footsteps of the Lawgiver. For we know that Moses did not hesitate to sub-

stitute the tribe of Levi for the first-born sons who were in the enjoyment of certain traditional privileges, vesting them with priestly functions, as soon as taught by experience that the institution abolished, although ancient and sanctioned by him, in the new circumstances in which the nation was placed no longer worked beneficially (Numb. iii., 12, 13).

It may not be here out of place to consider the development given to some of these institutions, which will, at the same time, show the freedom with which this court handled them, and its anxiety not to allow the letter of the law to override the spirit. The rabbis specify a number of laws and institutions which they attribute to the "Scribes." But as these personally had no authority to make any enactments, but could only do so as a body in their corporate capacity, these institutions must be considered as having originated with this court. Among these enactments there are seven named by way of eminence, "The seven commandments of the Rabbis." They are scattered in different parts of the Talmud, but will be found enumerated in "Sepher, Mitsvoth Hashem" (from p. 81 to 83). Three of these, which can be easily explained, I will mention.

The Synhedrion enacted the public reading of the scroll of Esther or Purim, and the celebration of the festival of the re-dedication of the temple after its restoration for divine service, consequent upon the defeat of the generals of Antiochus Epiphanes by the Maccabees. The celebration of both these festivals is ushered in by a benediction in which these institutions are ascribed not to the rabbis but to God, clearly in virtue of the power delegated to them in the Biblical

passage commented upon. Still more remarkable is the third institution—that of washing the hands before meals. It is likewise preceded or accompanied by a benediction by which the enactment is ascribed to God. The object of this institution, although differently explained by the rabbis, may be assumed to be this: The Jews of old were as little acquainted with the use of knife and fork at meals as are the oriental nations to this day. Instead of these convenient instruments the hands were used. Considerations of cleanliness and health, therefore, made it most desirable that the hands, previous to using them at meals, should undergo an ablution. But how was the unthinking mass to be induced to submit to this operation? The simplest way was to enjoin it as a divine commandment. The Synhedrion had the authority to do so, and it unhesitatingly exercised the authority for the benefit of the people.

Again, of the high priest Yochanan (King Hyrcanus), we read (Mishnah, Maase Shenee, Cap. v., 15) that he by his own authority ordered that the formulas prescribed by the law (Deut. xxvi., 5-10, 13-15) should no longer be recited by a Hebrew when offering the tithes to the priest. Further, the procedure in criminal cases was ordered, and this in so liberal, humane, and enlightened a spirit that even modern legislators might still learn something from it. The law of retaliation was, in practice, so tempered that it was deprived of all its apparent harshness (25); methods were fixed for the harmonisation of the lunar with the solar year, thus enabling the nation to keep the festivals in their right seasons; the manner in which these festivals were to

be promulgated was arranged, and the preparations for facilitating the journey for their celebration to the holy city, and the accommodation of the multitude, were made. The rigour of some Biblical regulations (Deut. xxii., 17), repugnant to the advanced popular refinement, was mitigated by an interpretation which, if it seemed to do violence to the plain sense of the text, had yet the merit of satisfying the feeling of propriety ; and of such a law as is enacted in Deut. xiii., from 13 to 18, we learn that it absolutely remained a dead letter (Tosephta Sanhedrin, chap. 14). Above all, it was the doctrine of the immortality of the soul and of future reward and punishment, which was now placed in the foreground and made a chief lever for the control of the popular emotional nature.

A new tenet, probably owing its introduction to intimate intercourse with the followers of the religion of Zoroaster, although traces thereof may already be descried in the Scriptures, received the tacit sanction of the Court and open currency and acceptance among the people, upon whose imagination it had a powerful hold, taking its place side by side with that of the immortality of the soul : This tenet is the resurrection of the dead (Doellinger the Jew and Gentile, etc., vol. i., b. 4., pp. 390 and 410) on the Day of Judgment. The doctrine, too, of good and evil spirits, probably flowing from the same source, found likewise admission and credence among the people. without, however, ever receiving the sanction of the highest religious authorities. But neither the expectation nor the wish for a saviour subsequently elaborated into that of the Messiah or Christ as yet existed, as the people enjoyed prosperity and had

only lately triumphed over its enemies, and therefore naturally felt no such want. The Messianic idea, as will be seen further on, was the slowly growing fruit which sprang from the troubles and disasters of the subsequent ages. It was the star which lighted up the gloom of the night, which, in later days, settled upon the nation. The study of secular knowledge was held in honour, and the qualifications for a seat in the Synhedrion were very high. Every member was, in the hyperbolical language of the Rabbis, to be acquainted with most of the existing languages, believed then to be 70 in number, agreeing with the number of the immediate descendants of Noah ; he was even to be conversant with the magic art. Schools for the diffusion of elementary knowledge were established throughout the country as early as Simon Ben Shetach, about ninety years before Christ. School boards were thus anticipated in Israel by nearly two thousand years. But these liberal tendencies, although meeting with the approbation of the people, soon encountered opposition.

An energetic minority, among whom there were not a few persons of high position, animated by what they considered conservative views, taking no account of the exigencies of the times, and the new wants and cravings of the age, saw with apprehension what they regarded as a deviation from the old paths and as dangerous innovations. This party, which we may call institutionalists, and which was for a time only a new school of religious thought, refused to admit the validity of the interpretations of the Law by its opponents. It contended that in the execution of the Law, regard should be paid to the letter only. About its spirit it did not

trouble itself. In its opinion, the narrowest technicalities were to be adhered to. It openly rejected the doctrine of a bodily resurrection, and maintained that that of the immortality of the soul and the other so closely connected with it future reward and punishment should, in imitation of the precedent set by Moses, not receive any prominence ; and that, consequently, every individual should be allowed to form and declare his opinion on the subject. This view was interpreted by its opponents as tantamount to a denial of this doctrine. It is, however, impossible to believe that this school should have formulated such a denial. There might have been individuals belonging to this school who had formed only vague ideas on this subject, or had not at all made it a subject of their reflections. They simply wished to leave the question where Moses left it. The analogy with a certain school of thinkers in our days will not escape my hearers. But a definite denial would have placed the party in flagrant contradiction with the law, which they professed to follow as their only guide ; for, as shown before, a hereafter, in some shape or another, must have been and was, believed in by Moses and Israel in general. Moreover, belief in a future reward and punishment can be logically deduced from the divine attribute of supreme justice. The erroneous conception was the more easily formed in the popular mind since the doctrines of the immortality of the soul and of a bodily resurrection were not always kept asunder in it ; and the two being confounded, the conclusion lay near that a denial of the latter also involved that of the former. The popular instinct, however, as is often the case, did

not mislead the mass; although, as is still more frequently the case, it did not hit the right direction. With the narrow-mindedness which not rarely characterises sectarianism, the school in question failed to perceive that, owing to a change in the situation, Judaism could no longer be sustained on the basis on which the Lawgiver had placed it (26).

When Moses promulgated his institutions, he could point, as a proof of their divine origin, to the close connection between obedience to them and its immediate happy consequences. The nation was, for instance, assured that the deficiency of the seventh year—the year of release—when all fields were to remain fallow, would be amply compensated for by the abundance of the harvest of the preceding year (Levit. xxv., 20-22); or that, so long as the divine commandments were carried out, the clouds would yield the early and latter rains in due time, and in proper quantity (Deut. xi., 13-16); and that neither famine nor pestilence would desolate the country (Exod. xv., 26). But this ocular evidence could now no longer be pointed to. We know from history that the year of release was not always preceded or followed by one of abundance (1 Maccab. vi., 49, 53, 54), and that the most scrupulous and minute attention paid to the several religious rites was no longer a safeguard against individual or national calamities. The providential special protection promised to obedient Israel seemed to have been withdrawn. What proof, therefore, had the mass of the divine origin of its code; and what inducement could be held out to it to submit to laws which exacted so many sacrifices? The Pharisees, with the clear-sightedness

which distinguished them, did not hesitate to draw forth from the obscurity in which it had been shrouded the only principle capable of sustaining the structure now so elaborately developed by them.

They adopted this measure with the greater confidence the more clearly they perceived that the reasons for which the Lawgiver seemed to have kept this doctrine in the background no longer existed, since time had dissipated the apprehensions which had caused this reticence. The priestly caste in Judea no longer occupied the position which it held in the days of Moses, and there was no longer any analogy between it and the priestly caste in Egypt. While the latter steadily maintained, if it did not increase, its influence with the people, that of the former as steadily declined (27). Limited to the performance of sacrificial rites, and superseded in the popular veneration by the prophets, whose functions were not restricted like those of the priest to one single spot, it had now to give way to the scribes, the scholars of the nation, and the interpreters, teachers, and magistrates of the people; and these scribes, allowed as they were to marry, and living, as they did, with and among the people, had naturally no interest apart from it—no ambition or other motive to work for the benefit of a special order, and no object to promote in their own circles. Moreover, they had never to appear as exactors of tithes, or any other legal perquisite, and therefore were much more likely to be popular with the mass than the priests.

Unable to perceive this, the elder institutionalists, mechanically clinging to the letter, from which life,

once pulsating in it, had fled, persisted in serving a corpse. Like every school of religious thought when it has proceeded to a certain length, having singled out various points to which it attached an exaggerated importance, and become passionately excited, it ended by becoming a religious sect contending, under the name of Sadducees, with the Pharisees for mastery ; and, as no idea remains in a state of isolation, but attaches itself to, or is productive of, others of an analagous nature in other spheres of thought, the views of this sect on religious matters soon became complicated with notions of its own on civil and political affairs. The sect became a political party, and, in time, drew the governing classes into the contest; Church and State being, in a theocracy, necessarily identical. It did not struggle unsuccessfully for the helm of affairs. From time to time the helm passed into its hands, although only for short periods. This contest was not without effect on the consolidation of Judaism.

Exposed to the severe criticism of the Sadducees, the Pharisees were compelled, in the administration of the law, to keep more closely to the letter. A portion of the freedom with which the Mosaic institutions were before handled apparently had now to be renounced. This was a retrogression forced upon them, which was unavoidable, setting precedents which exercised an injurious influence upon the further development of the law. One or two instances will exemplify this.

During the struggle of the Maccabees it was noticed that the enemy, turning to account the scrupulousness with which the Jews observed the Sabbath, attacked them on that day ; great disasters were the

consequence of these tactics. When this was perceived by the religious authorities, they, without consulting the letter of the law, simply obeying the exigencies of the moment and the high interests at stake, at once permitted defensive warfare on the Sabbath day (I Maccab., ii, 41, II Maccab., vi, 11). No recourse was had to any forced interpretation of the law, and no refuge taken behind any technicality. The law had given the court the power of deciding any question of a religious nature, and it exercised its authority with firmness and discretion (28). But when, a few generations afterwards, the right of a man to divorce his wife was discussed, the Academy of the illustrious Hillel, the head of the Synhedrion, one of the most noble-minded and large-hearted rabbis, disregarding the feeling of justice, refined and rendered more sensitive in the course of time, and taking its stand upon a too literal interpretation of a certain text (Deut. xxiv, 1), claimed for the husband the power of repudiating his partner in life on the most frivolous pretences (Talm. Treat. Ghittin, f. 90). Happily the holders of this view were this time defeated, the opposite opinion prevailing. Further, this illustrious chief saw fit to have recourse to an expedient which certainly has all the appearance of disingenuousness in order to remedy a crying evil, rather than openly exercise the authority vested in the court, and, like his predecessors, openly to set aside the injurious practice.

Experience had taught that the law which ordered the remission of debts, in the release year, far from benefiting the distressed, as was its original intention now, in the altered circumstances, operated to the injury of the poor ; for the rich refused to make advances to

those requiring pecuniary assistance, because they were afraid of the effect of the release year. The change in the conduct of the former towards the latter had been brought about by circumstances over which neither had control. As long as the people were purely agricultural, the commercial intercourse with other nations insignificant, and the fortunes pretty equal by reason of the inalienability of landed property, distress could only be the consequence of some unforseen calamity which could be easily mitigated, if not remedied, by the loan of provisions or seed corn until the next harvest. The loss of the loan when not repaid was not greatly felt; but when the people had been brought into unavoidable and permanent contact with nations governed by different laws, when landed property changed hands for good, taxation increased and trade became the means of large numbers for earning a livelihood; the value of capital was recognised, and capitalists whose living depended upon its possession durst not expose themselves to the risk of losing it by lending it out. The evil was manifest; how was it to be remedied? The straightforward course would have been to declare that since by adherence to the letter of the law its spirit would be killed, the letter must be set aside; and such undoubtedly would have been the line of proceedings in the days of the elder Maccabees, had the evil then shown itself. Not so in the days of Hillel. The bondage to the letter of which the Sadducees set the example, and no doubt their severe criticism on any step taken in a liberal direction, for which no justification, however remote, could be found in some text, exercised their pernicious influence. A device was

contrived under the name of *prosbul*, by means of which the letter of the law was saved, while its spirit was evaded. It was authoritatively declared that creditors who made over their claims to the Court would not lose them, as this would obtain payment, and then hand over the amount to the owner. By this arrangement the creditor did not violate the letter of the law, since he could not remit what was no longer owing to him. But he had no objection to accept payment from the Court, which acted as his deputy (Talmud Treat. Ghittin, f. 36; Mishnah Shebeeth, chapter 10).

The contest between the Sadducees and the Pharisees also operated injuriously in another way. When the Pharisees ultimately obtained the victory they, as was the case after the triumph of the Maccabees, and precisely for the same reason, began to attach an exaggerated importance to all those ceremonies and badges which had formed the shibboleth in their days of humiliation. Formulas were added to the prayers, distinctly affirming the doctrine of immortality, that of the resurrection (29) having long before found expression in the daily prayers. The counting of the fifty days for the celebration of the feast of weeks had to commence on the second day of Passover, and not on the Sunday following it (Lev. xxiii., 15), as the literal meaning of the text in dispute seems to imply. Henceforth the spiritual decay of Pharisaism became quite perceptible. The school of Shammai, contemporary and opponent of that of Hillel, became prominent for its rigorism and the tenacity with which it clung in its scriptural interpretation to a narrow literalism; in fact, the numerous differences between the two schools, often

referring to mere minutiæ, are complained of in the Talmud itself (see Talmud, Treat. Sanh., f. 10).

There was yet another circumstance which accelerated still more this downward career. The disturbances which had arisen under the later kings of the Maccabean dynasty led, as is known, to its overthrow, and the occupation of the throne by the Idumean Herod. This upstart prince, whose sympathies apparently were more with Rome than Jerusalem, seemed only to have one object during his long reign—that of currying favour with his patrons and lords paramount. To the Cæsars he looked up as to superior beings. To them he burnt incense. Them he aped. Anti-national institutions were cherished ; foreign customs fostered, and the views of the stranger befriended. The consequence was that feelings were excited among the patriots somewhat akin to those which in the mournful days of Antiochus Epiphanes had brought on such calamities. If the power of the usurper, supported as he was by Rome, was too firmly established to be shaken by the rage of his enemies, they could at least show their horror of those innovations, and their profound attachment to the ancestral religion, by observing with the greatest strictness all its minutiæ, by expatiating on their importance, enjoining them most emphatically, and setting as prominently as possible the example of the most careful observance of every detail of the rites. The more widely-spread and deeply-seated the aversion to these innovations was, the more general was the acceptance of this rigorism as a protest against royal latitudinarianism.

It was during this period of spiritual decadence that

he, from whose epithet Christianity derives its name, made his appearance. No wonder that his spiritual nature revolted against such narrow technicalities and devices for evading the spirit of the law, while seemingly fulfilling its letter. His fierce denunciations of the Pharisees are on record ; but impartial history will rather perceive in them the momentary ebullitions of an over-sensitive, ardent preacher, than the coolly-weighed utterances of a philosophical moralist. The Talmud informs us that there were seven distinct shades of Pharisaism, the one extreme bordering and touching upon the loftiness and saintly character of the Essenes, while the other wore the mask of the rankest hypocrisy. Between the two there was ranged the mass of the Pharisees of all colours and shades of religious opinion. There were Pharisees, we are informed, who were distinguished by every virtue which can adorn a scholar, patriot, and saint; and, again, others vain, superstitious, and ostentatious, paraded in the market-place the outward marks of religious zeal (30). It must have been the lot of Jesus to have fallen in with some of those lower-grade Pharisees. Unfortunately, this historical distinction is but little known, and his condemnation is thus extended to the righteous as well as to the wicked.

The death of Jesus, as known, was not followed immediately by the rise of a new religion, but rather by a new school of religious thought. Peter, its head, seems to have had no wish to break loose from his people and its tenets. It required a special vision to induce him to discard the dietary laws. There is no evidence that he went beyond this. Had this school

remained for a sufficiently long time in this condition, or even in the form of a new Jewish sect, it is probable it would have exercised a great and beneficial influence on the mother religion. It might have arrested the spiritual decay, and brought back the liberty of happier bygone days. But it was not to be. The preaching of Paul was so subversive of some of the leading principles of Judaism, that its incompatibility with the mother religion must have been evident to the meanest capacity ; and so successful was his ministration among the Gentiles, that the crowds of converts soon by far outnumbered and overbalanced the handful of followers of the other leading apostle. The Jewish-Christians soon had no other choice than either to allow themselves to be absorbed by the surrounding mass of Gentile converts, or to revert to the body, an offshoot of which they would have fain remained. The Jewish Christians vanished comparatively soon (as will be shown hereafter), and with them all prospect of exercising any perceptible influence upon the mother religion. The influence which Christianity exerted upon Judaism was not that arising either from amicable contact and friendly rivalry, or from wranglings within a defined area, such as those between sects standing on common ground, but that springing from fierce antagonism and from the coercion exercised by the stronger upon the weaker, as will be seen further on.

The antagonism between Pauline-Christianity and Judaism soon afterwards became still more embittered by a political element, which the unfortunate events of the day brought out with great prominence, and which thereby placed the daughter at a still greater distance

from the mother religion, even before Pauline-Christianity had finally prevailed.

When the last war between Judea and Rome broke out, which led to the well-known national catastrophe, it was naturally expected that every secondary consideration would be set aside, and that all would patriotically unite for the defence of the threatened country. So imminent and pressing was the danger that not a particle of the national resources could be spared. The whole nation, with the exception of the followers of Agrippa, flew to arms. Even the conservatives, as a party—there, no doubt, were individual exceptions—and the more thoughtful, who had opposed the insurrection with all their might, cast in their lot with their other countrymen when they saw that war was unavoidable (31). There was only one section which, in this fearful crisis, stood aloof. The members of the new sect withdrew from the danger, leaving it to its countrymen to conquer or perish, unhelped, and, perhaps, uncheered, on the plea of a certain prophecy of its founder (Eusebius's Eccles. Hist. iii., 1). After a protracted struggle, the country at last lay gasping and bleeding at every pore at the feet of the conqueror. A million corpses covered her face, and a hundred thousand captives, among them some of her noblest and fairest sons and daughters, thronged the slave markets of the world. But no battle-field was stained by the gore of any of the adherents of the new faith, nor did the fetters of the bondman press upon the limbs of any of its members. It may be easily imagined that in the mind of the prostrate patriot, if not in his utterance, the name of traitor was often joined to that of apostate,

and what reception he would have given to the approach of the deserter. All kindred feeling between the two was thus crushed out; and, although in subsequent ages repeated attempts were made by the Jews to recover their country, in no one were they joined by their kinsmen, the Jewish Christians (32).

Here is the place to speak of that other doctrine which, although not quite new, was only now fully awakened to a vigourous life, and acquired that powerful hold on the national mind which it has never since relaxed. I refer to the doctrine of the Messiah. Some of the prophets of old already, from time to time, in their addresses to the people, more or less distinctly hinted at a glorious period which should realise the most ardent hopes of the devout and patriots, which the past had failed to fulfil, and of which the gloomy present disappointed them. Some of the prophets connected this mysterious future with the God-chosen dynasty of David, while others again were contented with predictions of a less precise nature, discoursing merely, as it were, of a golden age hidden in the womb of the future, without bringing it in connection with any individual. These discourses, which partook as much of the nature of ardent wishes as of positive promises, stepped into the foreground and gained in vividness in proportion as the horizon became overcast. It was but natural that in this state the distressed mind should seek solace in a more or less distant cheerful future turning its glance away from the gloom confronting it, and fixing it on the bright vision not far off. Thus we read of the starving, that they feast in their dreams on the fatness of the earth. On the other hand, these expectations

receded into the background, and melted away in proportion as the soul longed less for them, by reason of the present prosperity enjoyed. These hopes were naturally much dwelt upon during the Babylonian captivity, but became weakened in the national memory during the happy repose enjoyed for a considerable time by the returned settlers in Judea, under the mild sway of the Persians. At least after the prophets Haggai, Zachariah, and Malachi, we hear of no such expectations until the calamities, especially the persecutions under Antiochus Epiphanes, commenced. The longing of the nation for a deliverer once more awoke. This longing was soon translated into a distinct promise of speedy fulfilment. A deliverer was promised—a deliverer was wanted—the deliverer must be near at hand. It is the book of Daniel which made itself the organ of this hope. The deliverer came in the persons of Judas the Maccabee and his brothers. Israel once more sat in safety—each man under his vine and fig tree—at least for a time. The idea of the deliverer, or saviour, receded. Soon new troubles arose. Judea fell into the hands of the Romans. Calamity now followed calamity. Again, the longing for a national deliverer awoke with great vehemence. At last the national disasters were consummated by the destruction of the temple under Titus. Could there be any doubt but that this national deliverer would soon make his appearance?

The extraordinary spectacle was thus presented to the world of two religions closely allied being in hourly expectation of a supernatural guide—the Jews of a worldly hero leading them on to the reconquest of their beloved country, and the Christians of the Son of Man

in the clouds, in order to judge the quick and the dead. But both were disappointed in their expectations. Now showed itself a distinguishing feature in the character of the two. While the expectation of the *speedy* advent of the Son of Man, which had given such a powerful impetus to the formation of Christianity, was allowed by the Christian world to recede more and more into the background, or, at least, was overtopped by other dogmas not so prominent in the New Testament; the doctrine of the Messiah now became, as it were, the first in Judaism recast, and has ever since occupied a foremost place in the array of Jewish articles of faith, has wonderfully shaped and moulded the fresh views, rites, and practices which have since sprung up among this people. Scores of times disappointed in their expectations, the hope of the advent of the Messiah has remained evergreen in their hearts, with the difference that while one portion of the nation, and precisely that which groans under physical oppression, expects him in the person of a mighty hero that will bring them deliverance, and restore them to their country; another section, and this precisely that from whose limbs the galling fetters of bondage have been struck off, looks for the advent of that golden age, or rather Messianic period, in which virtue will conquer vice, crime will not be thought of, every man will regard his fellow as his brother, and strive after the happiness of his neighbour as after his own. The cycle of Jewish doctrines is now complete. No new one has since been added, and no new one is ever likely to be added. I have now brought the consideration of the second period to a close, and proceed to that of the third.

THIRD PERIOD.

(From the destruction of the second temple, in the year 70, C.E., to the death of Moses Mendelsohn, in the year 1786 C.E.)

The temple had done burning, the corpses were buried, and the slaves disposed of. The fury of the conqueror was assuaged, and the fugitives, consequently, began to emerge from their hiding places, and as many of the survivors as had escaped into foreign countries began to repair to their own. But how different was now this country. The centre of worship, in which alone it was lawful to offer sacrifices, had vanished, and even had the courage and means for rebuilding it existed, nobody would have dared to ask permission for the undertaking. Those allowed to remain in the country were cowed and weighed down with imposts (33). No regard was any longer paid to their habits and peculiar institutions. Dispossessed, and intermingled with the heathen, some of the ancestral laws could no longer be kept at all, and others only very imperfectly. Chaos reigned everywhere in religious matters. Who was to bring order into this mass of confusion? and whence was the ray to come capable of lighting up this darkness? It is true the position, to some limited extent, was not without an analogy. During the Babylonian captivity, sacrifices had not been offered. But then the mass of the people had been altogether removed from their country. It was, therefore, clear that none of the commands, presupposing tenancy

of their own land, could be carried out. But such was not now the case. The remnant, if it did not exactly possess the land of their fathers, at least, breathed the air of the ancestral inheritance. From which of the obligations connected with this land was the remnant exempt, and which was still binding? Again, while in Babylon, the captives occupied settlements of their own, were allowed to follow the ancestral customs and obey the ancestral laws. The enemy of yesterday had become the friend of to-day. Further, there were prophets who could be consulted, could comfort in distress and raise up the drooping spirits in despondency. The elders of the people were allowed to hold their sway the same as though they were in their own country. But where were now the prophets? where the elders? The anxiously looked-for Messiah did not show himself. But yet the people did not quite remain without guidance. If there was not a ray, there was a streak of light. The guidance now came from one who, like a brand, had been plucked out of the fire. This brand was Rabbi Yochanan Ben Saccai, one of the most eminent Jewish teachers of the time, who succeeded in escaping from besieged Jerusalem, and having found favour in the eyes of the Roman general, Prince Titus, obtained from him permission to establish a college at Yamnia, where the Rabbi took up his quarters, gathered around him as many of his disciples as could reach this place of refuge, and thus formed a centre for all those who had escaped destruction (Talm. Treat. Ghittin, f. 86.)

Rabbi Yochanan was no ordinary man. Brought up in the school of Hillel the elder, one of the noblest

and most amiable of men, Yochanan reflected all the virtues, worldly wisdom, and learning, which distinguished the generation of rabbis that adorned the ages of the elder Maccabees (34). Being then advanced in years, he had had time to acquire a thorough knowledge of all the ancestral lore, traditions, and judicial decisions of the high courts of justice. While these qualities gathered around him, all those who instinctively felt that in him they had found the man capable of saving the remnant from religious ruin, they were also drawn to him, and kept at his side by the consciousness that, in consequence of the favour enjoyed by him with the victorious general, he was also enabled to extend to them efficient protection. At Yamnia, therefore, the rabbi opened a college which, under his presidency, was constituted a Synhedrion, and became the centre of a new organisation. Rabbi Yochanan, on this occasion, showed how thoroughly he was imbued with the spirit of the elder chiefs of these courts, and how well he understood the wants of his age. By his own authority, and against precedent and distinct understanding, he vested this court with all the privileges and rights possessed by the Synhedrion when in session in the hall assigned for its meetings in the temple, it having been held, up to this time, that no legal functions could be discharged by this tribunal beyond these precincts (Talm. Sanhedrin, f. xiv. b.) At Yamnia, now, the perplexed received guidance, the doubtful instruction, the waverers advice, the distressed relief, the mourner comfort, and the desponding hope.

Only one mistake was committed, natural enough in the time in which the rabbi lived, considering the

general conviction, shared by him, then prevailing, but which greatly marred the important work undertaken by him. The principle which guided him and his immediate successors was that the calamity was only temporary, that the deliverer would soon come and restore everything to its former position (35). Temporary arrangements, therefore, were only necessary in order to tide over the evil hour, and patience to bear the misfortunes of the day. Remedies were applied as opportunity served or occasion required. The practices of Judaism were, therefore, placed as it were in a provisional state. This was an evil; for as decennium after decennium passed without fulfilling this expectation, the arrangements made, which had been borne because it was thought that they were only temporary, became more and more grievous, especially as time had brought on changes still less suited for them than they had been before. But, as length of years had now rendered them venerable, new expedients were resorted to in order to bring about an accommodation—a *modus vivendi* as it were—which, in its turn, after some years became antiquated and called again for other devices, which, of course, could only be palliatives. The kernel of Judaism thus became tarnished more and more. And all this because narrow institutionalism took the place of those broad views of prophetism, I am inclined to call them, which guided the presiding spirits at the period that called Pharisaism into existence.

It may not be out of place to sketch here one or two of those accommodations which have made their mark in the history of Judaism, and have since remained

permanent and prominent institutions, although the foundation for them had been laid long before. As chronological order in this enumeration is immaterial, I shall pay no attention to it.

I alluded to the institution of regular set prayers. In the Pentateuch prayer was not prescribed. It did not form part of the regular worship ; it was left entirely to the impulse of the heart. The Biblical personages prayed as they were moved by the spirit, and as opportunity served. They, no doubt, set the example of prayer, and left us magnificent models thereof. But, for all this, prayer was not enjoined as a duty. The only exceptions are the form of benediction recited by the priest when blessing the people on certain solemn occasions (Numbers vi, 24-27), the confession of sin which the transgressor was to make while sacrificing a sin-offering (Levit. v, 5), and the formulas to be recited by the offerers of the firstlings and the prescribed tithes (Deut. xxvi, 3-10, 13-15).

But the idea of prayer is so natural to man that, as soon as the sacrificial service had been regularly established in the temple, and the priests and Levites undergone a regular course of training, prayers were added to the sacrifices, especially to the daily burnt offerings. Traces of these are found in the Psalms ; more clearly developed in later rabbinical writings. In the Babylonian captivity—when sacrifices, of course, could not be offered—the idea seems already to have risen in the minds of the devout that, if sacrifices could not be regularly brought, prayers at least might be offered up at the hours prescribed for the offering of the sacrifices. Of Daniel we read that he prayed three times a day, this

act being presumably mentally connected with the morning, afternoon, and evening daily offerings (Daniel vi, 11). In the regular worship of the second temple, we find already established a fully-developed system of prayers accompanying the offering of sacrifices. Now that sacrifices, owing to the destruction of the temple, had ceased, the duty of prayer which was to take the place of the sacrifices was more strictly enjoined; in fact, made obligatory (36). Certain forms, preserved to this day but somewhat modified and much enlarged, were composed, and it was prescribed that they should be offered up in those hours during which the sacrifices had to be offered while the temple yet stood. These prayers were to take the place of the sacrifices until the latter could again be offered. The synagogues, which previously had only been houses of meeting for mutual instruction and edification, and to which prayers were only incidental, now became real temples, and received their legal sanction (37). Of course in some of these prayers repeated and emphatic expression is given to the hopes that the sacrificial service would speedily be restored. These prayers remain to this day, although in Western and Central Europe it may be assumed that there are few educated Jews who really feel a longing for the restoration of a worship in which the slaying of beasts would form a leading feature. Around this simple institution of prayers there grouped themselves layer upon layer, in the course of time, numberless rites and observances, each of which was elaborated into details filling volumes.

Another institution, commenced from necessity while the temple yet stood, was afterwards perpetuated to

the great inconvenience of the people, and in direct opposition to the plain letter of the law, as generally understood, simply from that narrow veneration for antiquity which, as age succeeded age, became more and more conspicuous. I refer to the day added to each of the festivals. While the Synhedrion existed, the periods for the celebration of the festivals were appointed by this authority, in accordance with certain traditions based upon the letter of the law. As it was not always practicable to acquaint in time distant communities with the dates fixed for this purpose, it was ordained that an additional day should be celebrated, as thereby the contingency of violating the festival was prevented, since one of the two days celebrated was sure to be the right one. In process of time, however, it became necessary to substitute astronomical calculations for the fixing of the festivals in the place of the previous traditional procedure. This calculation could, of course, be made by every individual possessing the requisite astronomical knowledge. Uniformity as to the date of the festival was thus insured. The celebration of an additional day, therefore, became unnecessary. Here was an opportunity for taking off a burden from the shoulders of the people, and the text, "Ye shall neither add nor take away aught from it" (the law) (Deut. xiii, 1), would no longer have been violated; for, in order to get rid of this inconvenient text, it was explained to forbid the omission or addition of any detail in the practice of existing rites, but that it was by no means intended to take from the religious authorities that be the power of enacting new laws, so long as they were enacted in the name of the rabbis; and yet

what this text really seems to mean is, that there should exist no authority for either annulling any of the principles laid down, or adding a new one, such as is, for instance, claimed by the Roman Catholic Church when she is pleased to promulgate a new dogma. And rather than give in to the unanswerable arguments urged against the retention of rites when the reasons for their introduction had ceased to operate, a new principle was devised, that Jewish custom was Jewish law, and that custom overrides a legal decision (38).

It lay, however, in the temper of the times that, despite the most earnest efforts of the rabbis to preserve the institutions in their integrity and full vigour, and despite the minuteness with which every detail was elaborated, many more fell into desuetude, or had to be explained away, than were introduced. They had, in fact, to yield to *force majeure*. One of the first which ushered in all others, and gave them its sanction, was the compilation and authentic publication of the mass of traditions accumulated ever since the days of Ezra, handed down from master to disciple, and from Court to Court under what was named in subsequent ages the oral law, but which it was considered unlawful to place on record for public teaching. Apparently, the rabbis had three reasons for withholding their sanction from such an undertaking. They probably were in the first place afraid lest the publication of such an authentic collection might diminish their importance in popular opinion, since, in case of need, recourse might be had to the book for information instead of deriving it from their verbal instruction. Then, again, the book student lacking the instruction of the word of mouth and the help which it supplies by

gesture, tone, and, above all, by the opportunity which it affords for questioning, and thereby preventing misunderstandings and removing doubts, there was ground to fear that he might fall into error, and pronounce a wrong judgment. Lastly, owing to the veneration in which these traditions were held, they might, when authoritatively published, have been placed side by side with the written law, and be held in equal estimation as though they were another revelation, or might, perhaps, even have been confounded with it, and, being fixed in writing, would necessarily have lost the elasticity requisite if they were to be able to accommodate themselves to varying circumstances. But when, after the repeated insurrections against Rome, especially that under Bar Kocba against the Emperor Hadrian, thousands of Jews had perished—and among them also many of the most eminent rabbis, the chief depositories of these traditions, the study of the law and the practice of all distinguishing rites were strictly prohibited, and the survivors scattered over still wider areas than before—it became evident that the former policy could no longer be adhered to without exposing traditional Judaism to the risk of obliteration. A distinguished rabbi, therefore, the head of the Synhedrion, revered by his people for his piety and learning, high in the favour of one of the Antonines—which of them is not yet fully ascertained—undertook the innovation of compiling, systematically expounding, and publishing these traditions under the name of Mishnah or *Deuterosis*, i.e. the double, viz., of the written law, upon which it formed a commentary and became its companion book (39). There was now a basis for the oral

law upon which all religious Jewish learning was founded, from which it proceeded as though from a centre, and around which it revolved as its true spiritual pivot. It is this work, as will be shown further on, and the two most ponderous super-commentaries to which it gave rise in its turn under the title of Ghemara, or rather Ghemaras—as there are two, one composed in Palestine and the other in Babylonia—from which all the information bearing on the past Biblical development of Judaism is derived. The Mishnah and Ghemara together are called the Talmud; and, as a very lucid and graphic account of it has only a few years ago been published in the *Quarterly Review*, and, is probably still fresh in the memory of the public, it would be supererogatory to say anything further on its contents, although a few remarks on their genesis will be made further on.

Although in this case the right thing was perceived and done, yet the narrow technical spirit which dared not follow the broad common sense view of former ages showed itself again. Instead of being content with justifying the change by pointing to the altered circumstances without endeavouring to press into the service some text and extorting from it a meaning favourable to the change, but which it never bore, recourse was again had to a stale device redolent of disengenuousness. The verse (Psalms cxxi., 126) "It is time for the Lord to work, for they have made void the law," was rendered as though it meant that it was lawful to act as had been done in order that the people might not be compelled to make the law void (see also Mishnah Beracoth, the end.) Distortions of this kind which

now, unfortunately, became more and more frequent, evidently required that phrases, and even single words, should be wrenched from their context and applied in an unwarranted manner. This procedure—whatever may be said in its defence, and it, no doubt, admits of a different explanation (40), vested, as it came before the people, with the high sanction of the most venerated religious authorities—had an unfortunate effect, for it contracted the intellect of the studious youth, and gave it quite a bent, causing it to relish dazzling yet often false analogies, ingenuities, witticisms and leaps to conclusions, in preference to patient research, sound sense, and strict logical argument, based upon grammar and ascertained premisses. This characteristic of Jewish intellect has impressed its stamp upon Jewish mental productions, and marks them to this day wherever the Talmud is the chief study of the Jewish youth. But the institutions which chiefly experienced the stress of the changed position of the Jews now that they were scattered all over the globe, and frequently among nations antagonistic to them in every respect, were those which concerned their outward appearance.

The peculiarities of the dress which distinguished the Jews and marked them out for the sneers and ill-usage of their enemies had to be laid aside. According to the rabbinical interpretation of the texts, "and they shall be as frontlets between thine eyes, and they shall be as a sign on thy hand" (Deut. vi., 9), every Jew had to wear a certain head-gear minutely described by the rabbis, and a certain bandage on his left arm, known by the name of phylacteries. That there was a foundation for this interpretation is clear from the

peculiar kind of fillet noticed on the heads of a group of captives sculptured on one of the walls of an ancient temple—underneath which the words "King of Judah" were deciphered by Champollion and other Egyptologists—represented in the triumphal march of king Sheshank returning from his successful campaign against King Rehoboam. In Ezekiel, too, there seems to be an allusion to this head-dress, where it is called an ornament (Ezekiel xxiv., 17). In the New Testament the Pharisees are reproached, not for wearing, but for making their phylacteries broad. The rabbis attached to them a very high degree of sanctity, yet by degrees, and this for the reasons stated, they fell out of practice, and at last were only worn during prayers. The same was the case with the fringes prescribed to be worn on the four corners of the outer garment referred to in a previous lecture (Numb. xv., 37); and only at prayers the religious Jew, in commemoration of this command, wraps himself in his praying scarf, to the four corners of which are attached four fringes. If he no longer dared to parade in public the badges of his vocation, as a member of the family enstrusted with the custodianship of the great principles given into his charge for the benefit of mankind, he at least displayed them for his own edification, and that of his fellow believers in the seclusion of his place of worship (41).

The next institution to be disregarded was connected with a law most closely bound up with a state of affairs hardly a vestige of which had remained. I have referred before to the law which forbade a Jew to take interest from a Jew. I have pointed out that obedience to this

law was only practicable among a purely agricultural people, whose landed property was inalienable. But the Jews were now scattered far beyond the boundaries of the Roman empire. Agriculture had ceased to be their chief occupation, partly because, after the destruction of the temple, they for some generations were in daily expectation of a restoration to their own country, and, therefore, had no wish for a permanent settlement out of it; partly because in many countries difficulties were raised to their acquiring landed property, and partly also because this occupation could no longer be carried on by them profitably, owing to the necessity which had arisen for them to interrupt their labours for many more days in the year than their neighbours, as they had to rest on their own sabbaths and festivals out of religious scruples, and, in addition, on those of their masters from compulsion, or at least from regard for their religious scruples. Trading, and especially international trading, now became their chief occupation, but trade cannot be carried on without capital, and capital cannot be allowed to be used without interest. Interest, therefore, had to be taken, and interest accordingly was offered and accepted from a brother Jew, either under some thin disguise, or, openly without it.

Nor did the marriage laws escape the new influences. Polygamy, as is known, is allowed by the law of Moses. In a state of society which tolerates slavery the toleration of polygamy is the minor evil. But when a section of the Jews became scattered among monogamous Christian nations, the marriage law of the former naturally came into collision with that of the latter.

The marriage law, therefore, had to be altered. Polygamy was forbidden by a rabbinical synod (42). In this no violence was done to the spirit of Judaism, which certainly was as little favourable to polygamy as it was to slavery—the two, as I have shown, being most closely connected. But, then, how was it to be in the case of the death of a man who had left behind a childless widow? According to the law of Moses, the brother of the deceased was to marry the widow. To this there was no obstacle as long as polygamy was allowed. But monogamy having been once established, a married man might have been obliged to disregard this new institution by taking in marriage, in addition to the wife of his youth, the widow of his brother. To avoid the contingency of such a collision, it was enacted that under no circumstances whatever should a marriage of this kind be allowed, but the alternative prescribed by Moses in the event of the brother-in-law refusing to fulfil this duty to the widow must be resorted to. This alternative is described in Deut. xxv., 9, and resorting to it was blamed by the lawgiver, a certain stigma being attached to the family of the repudiator. The rabbinical enactment therefore avowedly abrogated an institution established by Moses. A proof that it was only the necessity of avoiding a possible collision with the law of the land which led to this alteration of the marriage law, is the circumstance that in Mahomedan countries, in which polygamy still exists, a brother-in-law is still allowed to marry his deceased brother's childless widow.

One more instance shall bring these exemplifications to a close. Everyone is acquainted with the laws of

Levitical purity, as minutely described in the third book of Moses (xv., 16). That they were observed may be seen from I. Samuel, xx., 26, and Mishnah Beracoth, c. iii. 4-6. To this day the sect of the Karaites, who affect to keep the law of Moses, literally observe these injunctions. In their synagogues may be seen during worship a number of individuals remaining in the vestibule, simply because they consider themselves as unclean, waiting to undergo the process of purification as prescribed. Yet all these laws were allowed to fall into desuetude, not because they could not be practised, but because their practice in the altered circumstances would have proved most burdensome.

A most minute rigorism in the practice of all these enactments and fragments of law, still upheld, was resorted to by the rabbis—recommended and enjoined by them in compensation, as it were, for the voluntary or compulsory disregard of those which were no longer observed. The predecessors of these rabbis, indeed, had set them the example and shown how scriptural supports and analogies might be found, be it for innovations or in defence of practices no longer answering their original purpose. The multiplication of Biblical commands was excused by the assumed necessity for making fences round the law (Ethics of the Fathers, l., 1), and accounted for by the declaration of a rabbi of old, "The Holy One, blessed be He! wished to give Israel an opportunity for acquiring merits, therefore He has given them numerous directions and commandments." One of the ancient rabbis laid down seven rules amplified into thirteen, and by another into thirty-

two, in accordance with which the law was to be explained, not all of them being able to stand the test of logic. (See Tosefta Sanhedrin, Sifra, col. 71, Aboth of Rabbi Nathan, c. 37.)

The argument was this. If the law was verbally inspired by God, it must bear the impress of his wisdom. There cannot be in it a superfluous letter, nay, not even a superfluous tittle or dot, and there must be good reasons for the sequence of the several laws. When, therefore, a law was repeated, or a word, or a letter, or even a dot seemed unnecessary, or the connexion between two consecutive texts not clear, it was allowable, nay, meritorious to search for the reasons of this apparent anomaly (43).

Three times it was enjoined, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in the milk of its mother." In consequence of this reiteration an extraordinary extension was given to this prohibition, and an application made of it which, to this day, exercises a vast influence in the household of every observant Jew. In consequence of this rabbinical interpretation there is found in the household of every observant Jew a double set of kitchen utensils—one set to be used in the preparation and consumption of flesh meats, and the other in those of milk food; and the observant Jew himself abstains for several hours from partaking of milk food after having eaten flesh meat—nay, even a third set of kitchen utensils were customary to be used for food which did not partake of either flesh or milk.

In other instances, however, this mode of interpretation has led to more satisfactory results. Thus, in the text, "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God," an eminent

rabbi of old thought he discovered a word which, in the original language, seemed to him superfluous. He therefore inferred that the text means to say that, in addition to God, man should also fear the disciples of the sages who teach man to fear God.

Re-action, however, set in. As in the time of the later Maccabees, the liberty taken with the text called forth Sadduceeism; so now this process, carried still farther than then, gave rise to the formation of a sect which, by way of protest, clung as much as possible to the literal meaning of the law. The Karaites, or Scripturalists, or Textualists, made their appearance, under the leadership of one Anan about the year 750, at the very seat of the academies in which the national traditions, or oral law were studied by way of preference, and whose authority at the time was acknowledged throughout the dispersions of Israel, as the saying was. Like Sadduceeism, it at first was rather a new school of religious thought than a sect. A similar revolt in the same regions, which may not have remained without influence upon Judaism, took place in Islam. In this religious system, too, the number of traditions received as binding had, soon after Mohammed, accumulated to an extraordinary degree. As a reaction, the Shiites, or heretics, broke loose from the Sunnites, the orthodox followers of the Koran, supplemented by a kind of Talmud, called the Sunnah. Ultimately, however, this Jewish school became a sect, just as was the case with the Sadducees, which, from controversy, proceeded to fierce antagonism to rabbinism. For a while the contest seemed to be equal; but after some time victory decided in favour of rabbinism. At

present the Karaites have dwindled down to a few congregations in Turkey, Egypt, the Crimea, and Galicia.

Nevertheless, the contest was not quite profitless. It once more directed attention to the Bible, especially the Pentateuch. In the long centuries which had passed since the elaboration of the traditional law the Bible had ceased to be the chief study of the rabbinites. Although the study of the law was extolled by the most eminent rabbis as the most praiseworthy occupation in which a Jew could engage, and although the flower of the Jewish youth devoted all its talent, all its leisure, and all its energy to this occupation, yet it was the oral, not the written law, which enjoyed this favour (44). The written law had come to be considered as the store-house to supply the pegs on which the thousands of traditional observances were to be hung. It was, in fact, in the eyes of the nation, a mere collection of texts from which each rabbi, without much attention to grammar, context, and logic, fetched as many as he deemed suitable for supporting the thesis which he intended to maintain. But the Karaites, having discarded all these traditions as so much lumber, were naturally compelled to fall back entirely upon the written law, to examine it critically, and for this purpose to have recourse to grammar and all other rational helps serving to elucidate the texts. The rabbinites in their polemices with them were, as a matter of course, compelled to have recourse to the same weapons both for attack and defence. A school of rational Biblical criticism thus arose which has ever since continued its labours in Judaism (45). From the time of Aben Ezra

in the 11th, to Benedict Spinoza, in the 17th century, there have never been wanting Biblical exegetists in the Jewish camp who have rendered distinguished services to the cause of Biblical criticism, and have paved the way for that rational treatment of the Bible which, having enabled the reformers of Christianity successfully to fight the battle of progress with the Roman Church, have led to results, one of the remotest of which is my being allowed to address an assembly, many members of which had in their early youth already inculcated on their minds all kinds of prejudices against that very religious system which I am now permitted to expound to them (46).

On the development of Judaism, however, the contest had hardly any effect. The only one which it produced was that it attached the mass of the rabbinites still more closely to the oral law, experience having shown that its absence at first destroyed all uniformity, and afterwards also all unity among the Karaites; and that in process of time, in order to remedy this evil, it was found necessary to establish new-fangled rules in many cases much more exacting, and entailing greater hardships than the traditions superseded. To give an instance, an observant Karaite, in conformity with the literal interpretation given by him to the passage, "Ye shall not kindle fire in any of your habitations on the Sabbath day" (Exod. xxxv., 3), has to shiver the whole of the seventh day in the cold of a Russian winter, and to spend in utter darkness the long Friday evenings in the same season.

At the beginning of this period, as we have seen, the centre of Judaism was still established in Palestine. Although

driven from city to city, and so often persecuted by the Roman power, as protected, the colleges still maintained themselves in that country. Hence the law was explained to all communities of Israel. The compilation of the ancestral traditions, known by the name of Mishnah, was elucidated and commented upon by the successors of the compiler rabbi Yehudah the Prince, and these commentaries in time again were collected under the title of Ghemara, or learning, parallel with the term mathematics, which has the same signification. Text and commentary together were called the Jerusalem Talmud from the religious capital of Judaism, although its compilation took place at Tiberias. But the time had come when Palestine's religious activity was to cease.

The high schools established by rabbi Yochanan ben Saccai and his colleagues had now existed for three centuries ; but, despite the intervals of prosperity which the college originally at Yamnia enjoyed, and the recognition of its chief by the Government, and the bestowal upon him of the official title of Illustrious, yet the authority of this school declined more and more. Indeed, the star of the Patriarchate—this was the name given to the Synhedrion by the Romans—began to wane soon after Christianity had mounted the throne of Byzantium. To the political enmity of the Jews, raised by their aspirations after national independence, and the consequent repeated insurrections, there was now added religious hatred. Christianity had now become something quite different from what it had been in the days of the apostles Peter and Paul. It, in fact, only retained the name. In essence it had materially changed. In appearance it had conquered polytheism.

In reality, however, it had been conquered by polytheism. Thus, at least, it appeared to the Jews. They saw the heroes of the Pagans and their demigods reappear under the name of saints, the consort of the chief god of the heathen under that of the queen of heaven and the mother of god, and found the supreme god himself associated with two other beings his equals in power and substance. It is true an explanation was offered of this tritheism intended to show that it was likewise a unity; but this explanation did not satisfy the Jewish mind, which opposed to it the plain sense of the divine announcement, "Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one." While, therefore, Judaism turned away mournfully, and with consternation from the new phase which the daughter religion presented, the wrath of Christendom was provoked by what it considered as the audacity of the Jew impugning the validity of the evidence brought forward in support of the new doctrines. This wrath burnt the more fiercely the more deeply Christianity felt the blow given by the unbelief of those to whose Scripture it had to appeal in testimony of the truth of its dogmas. It was as though the mother repudiated her own daughter. It was, in fact, a family quarrel carried on with all the acrimony characterising quarrels of this kind. Judaism, as the physically weaker party to the quarrel, had naturally to pay the penalty, and, as a matter of course, this penalty recoiled on the heads of the representatives of Judaism—the Jews. Legal restriction followed legal restriction, and exceptional laws became the order of the day. The authority, and with it the power of the Patriarchate, sank from day to day, and when in the year 420, in the

reign of Theodosius II., the patriarch Gamaliel died childless, the office was not filled again. Its discontinuance was the less sensibly felt, since the discharge of its chief functions had now sunk down into a mere formality, for the periods for the celebration of the festivals in their prescribed seasons could now be ascertained from a fixed calendar, and religious difficulties could be solved through the aid of the portions of the Talmud then already existing.

But, for all this, Judaism did not cease to have a centre. It expired in Palestine in order to revive in Babylon. In the provinces, along the Euphrates and Tigris, large Jewish populations had been settled ever since the time of the captivity under Nebuchadnezzar. Only a comparatively small portion of them had availed itself of the permission of Cyrus and his successors to return to the land of its forefathers. The bulk of the nation, prosperous and contented, remained in the country which had adopted it. There was, however, going on between it and the restored brethren in faith a constant spiritual and religious intercourse. Jerusalem was acknowledged by the Babylonian, as well as by all other Jews, as their religious capital. The Mishnah and some other similar compilations soon found their way to them from the Holy Land, and were studied and discussed among them with the same veneration and diligence with which they were treated in the country of their origin. Colleges were founded there at an early period, and the so-called head of the captivity, acknowledged by the government, acted a part analogous to that played by the patriarchs in Palestine. These colleges were in existence at the time

when the patriarchate became extinct in Palestine. The superior authority by which they were overshadowed being withdrawn, these colleges stepped into the foreground, and soon rose to a greater importance than was possessed by the academies whose place they now occupied. The centre of the Jewish religious authority became thus shifted from the west to the east, and there it remained for several centuries. During this period a new commentary on the Mishnah was there elaborated, which, owing to the influence of these colleges, was tacitly received as a standard for the practice of Judaism wherever it became known. This work is the famous Babylonian Talmud, which to this day forms the text-book in all Jewish academies, and with which every rabbi is expected to be acquainted. But these colleges, too, in process of time declined. However, not before the study of the Talmud had found a new home in the dominions of the Crescent, especially in North Africa, Spain, and the South of France, whence it gradually spread all over Europe. The oral law had now a canon the same as the written law. This canon was closed, not by any synod, but by the force of circumstances, which, while preventing the exercise of authority on the part of the colleges, procured for their labours tacit assent and acceptance. All that now remained to be done was to apply the contents of this canon to the ever varying emergencies and wants, begotten by the constantly changing events of the day. It is the Babylonian Talmud, and the religious codes based upon it, which form the chief bulwark of the rabbinism of our days, and the cornerstone of the building which was commenced by Moses.

Simultaneously with the display of this activity, events took place in Europe—now the principal seat of Talmudical studies—which left their deep impress upon the minds of those who chiefly compiled the religious codes, and were looked up to as the leading authorities in all religious matters, and gave the final touch to Judaism as it now is. The period of the earlier Karlovingian princes in France, and of the Ommeyades in Spain, was one of great prosperity and contentment for the Jews. These enlightened rulers recognised the special value of the Jews, who then formed the principal international links in the trade between Europe and the other then known quarters of the globe. As intermediaries and interpreters between the followers of the Cross and the Crescent, between the old established civilisation in the East and the nascent one among the young, vigorous, yet illiterate nations of the west, the Jews were truly invaluable. Jews and Christians lived on the best of terms. Ghettos were unknown, except as far as Jews sometimes voluntarily took up their abodes in one and the same quarter for convenience sake, in order to be able to discharge their religious duties in fellowship with greater comfort and satisfaction. Legal restrictions upon them did not exist, and the examples of Christians preferring the religious expositions of the rabbis in the synagogues to the discourses of the clergy in the church were not rare. The freedom then enjoyed by the Jews reflected itself in the excellent literary productions composed by them, some of which are extant to this day. Had this happy condition continued for any length of time, the cheerful temper and

the enlightened sentiments which it must have begotten, could not but have succeeded in working off their religion the dark coating in which the calamities that befel them had wrapped it; but, unfortunately, this was not to be.

In the second half of the eleventh century a movement, which had set in some time before, began profoundly to agitate Europe. A religious frenzy seized upon its western and central population. Europe rushed furiously on Asia. The crusades broke out, and the reasoning on the part of the crusaders lay near enough, "If it be a meritorious work to avenge the wrongs of Christendom on the distant Moslems, it must be still more meritorious to avenge the sufferings of Christ on his tormentors living in our midst, who continue to crucify him by their unbelief; and, as they are cast off for ever, there can be no harm in our anticipating the divine judgment by a short time, and sending them down to the dark regions to which they are doomed. Nor can we, the executors of the divine judgment, be charged with robbery if we appropriate to ourselves their possessions, which are the reward due to us for our zeal, for the glory of God and his holy Church, and the trouble we had in sending them to their doom." Each of the crusades, consequently, was marked by a track of Jewish blood; and, when this fury had spent itself, and the few survivors began again to breathe, the pestilence known as the Black Death visited Europe, and more than decimated its inhabitants. Forthwith the cry was raised that the Jews were the authors of the calamity, they having poisoned the springs and wells. The tortures inflicted on this unfortunate people in

consequence of this charge, and the judicial murders committed, were most revolting.

Thus broken down, persecuted, crushed, overwhelmed with taxes, and marked by ignominious badges, the Jew withdrew within the walls of his ghetto, now become his prison, with despair in his heart, timid, like a hare trembling at the rustling of a leaf, for life and property, incessantly intent upon contriving devices for defending himself against the violence or wiles of his enemies. No wonder that the despondency to which he had been a prey after the defeat under Bar-Cochba should have returned—that in this struggle his mind became naturally contracted, all his energies concentrated upon himself, his senses sharpened to scent the adversary afar off, and his wits rendered acute by contriving expedients to extricate himself from the toils of his pursuers. Deep gloom, therefore, sank into his soul, reflecting itself in every movement, sentiment, and action of his. Indifference to the outer world, its course, graces, and harmonies, was the consequence, and asceticism marked his life. The lowest depth of woe was reached when his brethren were expelled from the Pyrenean peninsula in the year 1492.

In this distress there remained only one friend for him, before whom he needed not to simulate a smile on his lips, while bitterness filled his heart, before whom he could pour forth all his lamentations without fear of wearying him. This friend was God, and the place where he could pour forth his innermost soul undisturbed was the synagogue. No wonder that he protracted his stay there more and more, that the services became longer and longer, and the language in which he

complained of his persecutors bitterer and bitterer. This bitterness of soul, his asceticism, this feeling of strangeness amidst a world that disowned him, now began to mark all prayers and literary works composed during this sad period, and especially the religious codes compiled from the Talmud to guide him in the practice of the rites and observance of the customs prescribed for his daily life. No form of prayer was too long for him; no repetition thereof too tedious, and no observance too minute. For all this was intended to increase for him, in the world to come, that happiness which was denied to him in the present.

The code for the regulation of the daily life of the Jews, compiled during this sad period, is a masterpiece of logical order, in which every action in every situation of life—whether of a physical, intellectual, or moral nature, from the moment the eyes opened in the morning to that when they closed in the night—is defined and prescribed with a most marvellous precision and minuteness. Nothing, in fact, is too common for the lynx-eyed codifyer but he can stoop to it, and nothing too sublime but he can rise equal to the occasion. From the manner in which the observant Jew should pare his nails to the posture which he should assume in his orisons—everything is laid down, everything measured, and everything weighed; nothing left, either to chance or the inspiration of the moment. The tendency of the interpreting glosses, which were, of course, added at later periods being to exact more and more sacrifices, and impose more and more deprivations.

The difficulty to rise from this depressed condition was the greater, the greater was the horror with which

all secular knowledge was viewed by that people. Of this knowledge, such as it was, the clergy was the sole representative during the middle ages, and even long after these had passed. But the clergy unfortunately had but too often proved themselves the fiercest persecutors of the Jews. Some of the dread, therefore, and dislike of the representatives was transferred to the represented. Secular knowledge became, in the eyes of the Jews, the symbol of a body at whose hands they suffered so much. It was feared that engagement in this pursuit might establish points of contact with the persecutor and tempter, and thus lead away from the ancestral religion; and, since most of those who engaged in this study were persecutors of the Jews, did not the suspicion lie near that it was this study which fostered hatred to the Jew? Reason enough to discountenance in the ghetto every attempt at cultivating any other branch of knowledge save that of the Talmud. The atmosphere of the close ghetto required the admission of a stream of fresh air for its purification, and it was precisely this stream which was zealously kept out. Such was the religious condition of the Jews even in enlightened Europe as late as the middle of the last century, when an individual made his appearance destined to work a marvellous change. This individual was Moses, son of Mendel, a native of Dessau, in Germany, who subsequently became known as Moses Mendelssohn. With his life and activity begins the fourth and last period which I am discussing.

FOURTH PERIOD.

From the death of Mendelssohn in 1786, to our days.

The revival of classical literature in Western Europe, after the conquest of Constantinople by the Turks (in 1453), the discovery of America (in 1492), and the reformation in Germany (in 1517)—events which succeeded each other at comparatively short intervals—had given an impetus to progress such as had perhaps never before been experienced. It was especially the Reformation which exercised a most beneficial influence upon the advancement of religious toleration. It is not that the reformers were more tolerantly disposed than their antagonists, but that the principles laid down by them, and upon which they took their stand, involved that toleration which, loosened from the shell which formed its involucrum, was a stranger to their sentiments. It is only gradually that their successors became conscious of this consequence involved in the principles advocated by them. If the minority had the right of claiming tolerance for its opinions on the ground that, in matters of conscience, the majority could not be permitted to force its views on the dissentients, the right claimed for themselves could not be refused to those who differed both from the majority and minority. The opinions of the Jews, for consistency's sake, could no longer be excluded from the domain of toleration. The reformers were, therefore, compelled by their own principles to concede to the Jews toleration, and even incline

their ears to the arguments urged by them in defence of their opinions.

Simultaneously, a line of argument, springing from this contest between reformed and unreformed Christianity, operated in favour of toleration of the Jews. The Roman Catholics, after having tried in vain with fire and sword to put down the new heresy, or apostacy, as reformed Christianity was called by them, were at last compelled to tolerate the heretics, not of course from principle, but from sheer necessity, and thus, getting gradually accustomed to the idea of religious toleration, they argued naturally enough : If we tolerate those who were born under the authority of our church, and over whom she has an indefeasible right, but who have now turned rebels and apostates, we may, *a fortiori*, tolerate those over whom the church confessedly never had any authority, and who, therefore, cannot be considered as heretics and apostates. Toleration, therefore, was the undesigned boon presented by the Reformation to the Jews. Henceforth Christianity, unconsciously to itself, breathed a somewhat milder spirit towards Jews and Judaism.

The secular power, too, had become less willing to prove a blind instrument in the hands of the Church. The progress was at first very slow, and hardly perceptible ; and, although for two centuries longer fluctuations in the treatment of the Jews continued, yet the tide of persecution no longer advanced ; and, even as the summits of the mountains are the first to be warmed and illumined by the rays of the rising sun, so were the superior minds the first upon whom these new notions of religious toleration dawned. Two uneventful cen-

turies thus crept on. During this time, even as the fierce hatred to the Jews cooled down in the breast of Christians, so did the feeling of revenge upon the persecuting Christian in the heart of the down-trodden Jew. They drew near to each other without being conscious of it. At last the time came when the progress was sufficiently great to become perceptible.

As a slight gust of wind suffices to shake an apple from the tree when it is ripe, so a circumstance of no great significancy in itself sufficed to allow the spirit of toleration to break through. The previous century had produced two Jewish scholars of wider fame in their days than that of Moses Mendelssohn in his. Although Menasseh ben Israel, of Amsterdam, is now only known to the student of the literature of the seventeenth century yet in his time he was much looked up to, his works were much studied, and he himself was greatly admired and esteemed by eminent scholars, statesmen, princes, and other influential personages. Benedict Spinoza, likewise a Dutch Jew, was a man who, as one of the profoundest and acutest thinkers of the human race, left his mark not only upon his generation, but also upon all succeeding ages. But neither was able to produce a permanent impression in favour of the people from which they sprang, because the right time for it had not yet come. At last it came.

A poverty-stricken, hunch-backed, shy Jewish lad came in the first half of the last century to Berlin, in order to pursue there his Hebrew studies. Soon his thirst for knowledge led him also to other studies. Clandestinely, and, under the guidance of other co-religionists, who, amidst difficulties similar to those

with which he contended, had acquired some secular knowledge, he trod the thorny path. He studied the German and Latin languages, and, using these as stepping stones, soon familiarised himself with the branches of classical and general literature, and the domain of science which then constituted a liberal education. As an autodidact, and considering the circumstances in which he was placed, he was a prodigy. Chance made him acquainted with Lessing, one of those choice spirits upon whose enlarged and enlightened mind the rays of toleration had cast their effulgence. Through Lessing the timid Mendelsohn was introduced to the literary world as a philosophical author who wrote in a classical style. He rose one morning, and found himself in the metropolis of German intelligence, if not famous, at least favourably known. Well versed in rabbinical lore, and a scrupulous observer of all practices of the ancestral religion, not even a microscopic search into his conduct could discover a flaw in it. A band of young talented co-religionists soon gathered around him, imbibed from him their taste for general literature and science, learned from him to appreciate system and method, the absence of which then marred all Jewish education. Of these, nearly every one in due time as they were scattered about formed a new centre, around whom a fresh circle gathered until the sentiments of the master were spread far and wide. The house of Mendelsohn in time formed a point of attraction to all who had any pretension to literary or scientific eminence in Berlin. No traveller of any standing visited the capital in which Frederic II. resided without paying his homage to the

Jewish philosopher, Moses Mendelssohn. His high attainments, noble character, and modest bearing, extorted, even from the most inveterate Jew-hater, the confession that a race which could produce such a distinguished specimen of humanity, could not be so utterly worthless and so degraded as it had been represented. The champions of toleration and progress who fought the battle of the Jew could now point as a justification of their sentiments—for toleration to the Jew at the time still required a justification—to one of this people, who, without any help from without, simply by the vigour derived from the native sap, had raised himself to an intellectual and moral height attained only by few of those who enjoyed every advantage which birth, example, and education could afford ; and there were already statesmen and princes noble-minded and enlightened enough to deem it worth trying an experiment with the Jews, reputed to be incorrigible.

Before all, admission was given to their youth to the halls of science, and behold it rushed into them with an eagerness which was unexpected. Having tasted of the tree of knowledge, and the social bars separating Jew and Gentile having been lowered, if not thrown down, a contest was renewed in the breast of the Jew which had already twice before been fought in his innermost being. As in the days after Alexander the Great, when the secluded Jews first came into contact with Greek life and literature, as in the days of the Spanish Khalifate, when Arab civilisation began to fertilise the adjoining Jewish intellectual soil, so now, when western views, saturated with Christianity, found access to Jewish minds nurtured in a circle of ideas totally

different from those now encountered, there was a woful clashing of sentiments and jarring of the most disharmonious opinions. Was western civilisation compatible with rabbinical Judaism, such as it had come down to their days? This was the momentous questions which many a thoughtful mind now put to itself. Mendelssohn did not live to see the contest. He seemed to have been hardly conscious of the mighty revolution of which, if he was not the cause, he was certainly the occasion. He died in 1786, practising to his last moment even the most minute observances prescribed by rabbinical Judaism; but soon after his death the contest broke out with great violence.

It was a most gifted generation among which the contest raged, and it had to be fought out under decided disadvantage; for influences from without complicated the struggle, tended to blind the combatants, and gave an undue weight to one side of the controversy. These influences proceeded from some of the highest quarters intent upon bringing over the Jews to Christianity. It was no longer brutal force that was to be employed, but subtle calculation. Their highest and noblest aspirations were to be used as the channels of corruption.

The successors of Frederic II. of Prussia, and of Joseph II. of Austria, were animated by an extraordinarily narrow spirit of conversionism. Every facility for gratifying the thirst for knowledge was afforded to the Jews. The portals of science were thrown wide open to them, while at the same time every avenue for its application was closed against them. From the office of a night watchman to that of prime minister,

no public function, whether municipal or political, was accessible to them. The only passport for admission was conversion—whether from conviction or not was a matter of the utmost indifference to the authorities. The position of the Jews of education thus became most painful. They had spent the prime of their lives in the acquisition of the branches of knowledge which were of no use in common life, and had only a value in the learned professions or the discharge of public offices. They had developed their mental powers exclusively in this direction. They were good for these offices or for nothing. It was too late in life to turn to anything else. The choice left them was either to pine away their lives in obscurity and poverty—they who felt within themselves that they were born for something higher than to grovel along in the dark places of the earth like vermin—or to purchase the opportunity for finding a proper sphere by a lie on the lips and shame in the heart. Many, and among these some of high talent, succumbed ; but the most high-minded and talented among them passed unscathed through the furnace. But there were also some converts who, to avoid self-reproach, and probably also self-contempt, persuaded themselves that they had changed from convictions and not interest. These pretended that Judaism required reform, and that reformed Judaism, in reality, was Christianity. This was one method attempted for solving the problem now pressing on the attention of the rising generation. Another section, despairing of ever seeing reform in Judaism, and either too cowardly to change the ancestral religion, or so strongly bound to it by the ties of habit as to be

unable to break them, remained for their own person within the pale in which they were born, and either coquetted with the dominant religion, or had their children brought up in it, in order, as they said, to save their offspring the pangs of the struggle which they had to endure themselves, and to secure to them without sacrifice and effort all the privileges and enjoyments in readiness for those who swim with the stream.

On the other hand, another section, horror-struck at the apostacies around it, clung with the greater tenacity to every detail of the ancestral religion, just as the traveller in the fable wrapped himself the more closely in his cloak the stronger the hurricane blew. The members of this section scented treason in every direction, and never ceased denouncing, and not rarely anathematising, even the most harmless proposal for a modification in any usage, however obsolete, however barbarous. The very study of the vernacular was tabooed, and even an attempt at acquiring a grammatical knowledge of Hebrew was viewed with considerable suspicion.

Between these parties, the butt of all of them, cordially hated by some, and mercilessly abused by the others, stood that which, occupying Jewish ground, yet was firmly convinced that the supposed abyss between Judaism and general culture, as pretended by the superficial and those whose interest it was to make themselves believe in it, did not exist, and that means could be found for harmonising the practices of their creed with the claims of modern European life. Reforms were attempted by them, which, at first, were chiefly confined to divine service, or the outward and

more striking manifestation of the inward religious conviction. Subsequently these attempts were extended, amidst the most decided opposition of the so-called orthodox party, to various customs and rites. The scene of these reformatory attempts was Germany almost exclusively. There several synods composed of rabbis and laymen were held, but none of them succeeded in enlisting on its side public opinion to any considerable extent. No settled new school of religious thought has, as yet, been evolved from this strife, although indications of it are already described.

Amidst these contentions a generation had grown up which, still rooted in historical Judaism, nevertheless drew its breath from an atmosphere impregnated with all those ideas which form the heritage of modern time. It was a generation full of earnestness and respect for antiquity, and for the traditions of bygone ages without being their slave. A generation, nourished at the breast of history and philosophical inquiry, which strove hard to pierce the thick coating enveloping the kernel of Judaism, argued within itself: Every phenomenon has its ground in one that preceded, and pursues an object which is the justification for its existence. It fades and perishes when this object is attained. How is it that the principle within me has been able to resist all shocks and even to outwear all corroding influences which have disintegrated so many nationalities, civilisations, and religions? How is it that in my veins throbs a higher life, and this with a greater vigour than pulsated in them since the days of the destruction of our national independence; and, discarding all mere theories and speculations, sets to work at the hand

of history endeavouring to solve the problem. And it believes it can solve it.

Taking up the thread of religious development where the prophets dropped it, and adopting the principle laid down by them and followed out so intelligently by the successive high courts down to the time of the later Maccabees, and even at later periods, recognised by most eminent rabbis down to our own days, it says : All that I have to do is to spin this thread further, taking care not to receive into the web any of the elements which disfigure, discolour and weaken the tissue produced during the ages of bewilderment caused by heresy or reaction, mostly the consequences of persecution from without. The legislator has laid down for my people doctrines or principles, and institutions. The former are by their nature eternal and unalterable. They designate God's essence, his relation to his creatures, and the relations between them fixed by Him. They must be as unchangeable as his essence. The latter must be mutable, since tokens, by their nature, are changeable even while the things betokened remain always the same. In this sense, from Moses to our days, institutions have been changed, modified, allowed to be dropped, and new ones added. The authority for this discretion given by Moses, and never since allowed to fall into desuetude, has been acknowledged by the rabbis who have laid down the principle, "Jephthah in his generation is like Samuel in his" (Treat. Rosh Hashanah, xxv., b), meaning to say that the exercise of this authority does not depend upon the personal merits of a religious functionary, but on the office held. A high court duly elected would, in our days, have the same authority as

was possessed by a Synhedrion in the days of the Maccabees (47).

True, that certain rules were laid down for the exercise of this authority, but these rules were made by one Court, and can therefore be unmade by another (as was actually done by rabbi Yochanan ben Saccai) which must also by the same authority be empowered to put its own construction upon any restrictive measure. In fact, these rules have been altered according to the exigencies of the time (48).

Further the law has destined my people to be a kingdom of priests. The prophets have carried this idea still further, and have declared this people to be a missionary people. The rabbis have defined this idea still more clearly by pointing out that these missionary efforts should be restricted to the promulgation of the so-called Noachidae laws, all of which refer to institutions betokening God's most prominent attributes without the practical acknowledgment of most of them society, indeed, could not exist (49). The same rabbis, in the sense of the prophets, have disclaimed the possession of future bliss for their people exclusively by laying down the principle: "The pious of all nations have a share in the world to come" (Sanhedrin xiii.), and have, moreover, in order to facilitate to the pious the acquisition of a knowledge of the principles of Judaism, and the practice of the institutions betokening them, authorised the order of the proselytes of the gate, who were distinctly exempted from the observance of all laws bearing on Israel's special custodianship (50). Let this institution be revived; it will serve as a rallying-point to the enlightened of all nations.

Let Christians and Mahomedans by all means be zealous in the work of conversion. They will only work for the principles of my people. These principles are too sublime to be comprehended in their purity by the unprepared mind. From Paganism to Judaism there is such a spiritual distance as cannot be cleared in one bound by unaided efforts. Preparatory transition stages have to be passed through. Christianity and Mahomedanism form these stages, suited to the differences of tempers and degrees of culture, characterising the divers populations of the pagan world. This has even been admitted by a most eminent rabbi (51). When they have served their apprenticeship to these religions, and a yearning shall have been awakened after something higher and more perfect—after something that will satisfy the noblest instincts of the soul, and does not jar with the results of science, the rules of logic, and the highest perceptions of intellect—then they will turn to the principle of Judaism, and find the repose after which their souls will long in the rabbinical institution of the proselytes of the gate.

It is then that, in the words of the prophets, the law will go forth from Zion, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem (Isaiah, ii., 3). Israel, harmonised in consonance with the principles of Judaism, with the demands of an enlightened, progressive, and scientific age, will then be prepared to fulfil its highest mission—that which gives it a right of existence, and without which it has no more valid claim to continuance than had ancient Greece or Rome. In the realisation of these hopes it perceives the promised Messianic kingdom—the kingdom in which all men shall be equal,

and eternal peace shall prevail, and they shall cease to hate each other for differences of opinion, but shall all unite on the common ground prepared by the exalted principles of Judaism in order to carry out the behests of the Most High, as declared by the mouth of the physical and spiritual laws, both alike promulgated by the Supreme.

CONCLUDING CHAPTER.

The objects for which these lectures were delivered, and now published, are fourfold.

It was, in the first place, intended to show to that portion of the general public which takes an interest in religious matters, that Judaism is not quite the mummy which it is represented to be. As a rule, all that the general public perceives in Judaism, is a mass of observances and ceremonies which, if they do not always prove repellent, always appear strange and, if not absurd, at least meaningless. But too often it escapes notice that in many of them there throbs a vigorous life, and all of them have, or at least had, their *raison d'être.* Misconception must necessarily lead to misjudgment ; but all truths are closely connected. They, in fact, form an organism, of which each individual truth may be regarded as a limb. You cannot misjudge one but the error must in a larger or smaller degree extend to the functions of all of them. It, therefore, becomes the duty of all inquirers after truth to endeavour to correct any

erroneous notions upon which they are able to throw light.

Moreover, the misjudgment of a religious system leads also to that of its professors, and may result in casting suspicion on their moral integrity, or in assigning to their mental powers narrower limits than they really have. It is clear that even material injury may grow out from such views to the professors of a misjudged religion. It is, therefore, an act of self-defence if a professor of such a religion comes forward for the purpose of dispelling prejudice.

The lecturer's second object was to present to his brethren in faith their religion from a point of view in which it is not often regarded by them. To a large number of Jews their religion has become a thing of mere habit. It is the outward practice, and not the in-dwelling idea, which chiefly occupies their attention. Of this every one interested in the matter can easily convince himself by examining their religious literature. For one exposition which treats of the latter, there are a hundred which discuss the former. The consequence of this is very unsatisfactory. The thinking portion of the Jewish community is apt to become indifferent to a religion, the constituents of which do not appear to them calculated to exercise any appreciable ennobling influence upon man's moral nature, while the unreflecting mass gets accustomed to the idea that it can discharge its duty to its Maker by the practice of mere forms. The former are apt to fall into infidelity; the latter into superstition.

The evil is still more increased by the belief of both

parties in the inalterability of the existing form. The former get thoroughly disheartened by what they consider as injurious without having the power of applying a remedy; while the latter get confirmed in their view by the rust of antiquity with which imagination coats the endeared institutions. One of the objects of these lectures was to undeceive both. The object was to show that the institutions of Judaism—such as they are—are the outcome of time; that they grow and decay like every other organism, and were as little able to escape the universal law of change as any other phenomenon under the sun. The development of this side of the subject might, no doubt, have admitted of much larger dimensions than it received in the lectures. The rise and decay of many more institutions than those referred to might have been unfolded; but these additions would have increased the number of illustrations without augmenting their force. Such an addition, therefore, was deemed unnecessary.

Again, several other sources of change besides those enumerated might have been traced; such, as for instance, the influence exercised upon Judaism by the agency of prophetism, the peculiar bent given to this religious system by the activity of Ezra and Nehemiah, at a later period, by the views of the philosophical schools of Alexandria, the rise of Gnosticism, the transition of Talmudism into Rabbinism, and, at a still later period, by the Kabbalah. It is even possible that the lecturer has undervalued the effect of these influences. Criticism will have to pronounce its verdict on this gap; and should it prove a more serious defect than the lecturer at present believes, it will be his task to endeavour at a

future period to fill the lacuna. But at present he is of opinion that these, after all, are not of primary importance but mere tributaries, while the springs actually pointed out and followed constitute the principal ones.

But is there no lesson to be learned from the discovery of the agencies which were at work in the development of Judaism, and of the laws which underlay the growth and decay of the institutions, some of which it was endeavoured to trace in the lectures? To a cultivated mind the laying bare of the hidden machinery, as it operates and brings about the changes which attract general attention is, no doubt, a source of pure abstract pleasure; but the lecturer candidly confesses that the production of this satisfaction was not the object for which he came forward. He was actuated by a different motive. He is one of these who shares the opinion of thousands of his co-religionists that Judaism in its present form does not fully answer the purpose for which it came into existence. Some of its institutions—let it be observed, it is institutions, not principles, the suitableness of which for the present time is called in question—are, undoubtedly, antagonistic to established results of experience, science, or enlarged deepened theological and moral notions and refined feelings, while still more of them no longer commend themselves to the innermost convictions of the soul. The holders of this view are chiefly found among the educated; it may, therefore, be presumed that this opinion will spread in proportion as education spreads.

It were, however, unjust to this class to maintain that

this opinion is the consequence of their unwillingness to submit to the deprivations which these institutions impose upon their followers. There are, no doubt, many of them in whom the desire of being free from all trammels in the enjoyment of life outweighs every other consideration ; but, on the other hand, there are also many who, earnest, thoughtful, conscientious, and full of veneration for antiquity and its products, show by their lives that their ideal is much higher than mere enjoyment, whether of a physical or intellectual nature, and that they can forego and make sacrifices for what they regard as sacred and wholesome, but who, nevertheless, consider several institutions of the ancestral religion, as handed down to them, no longer satisfying the longings of their souls. And the very fact that this dissatisfaction chiefly manifests itself among the educated should be well calculated to attract the attention of Jewish conservatism ; for the difference between the educated and uneducated does not consist so much in the greater amount of knowledge possessed by the former as by the greater habit of reflection and ability to compare, reason and draw just conclusions acquired by them.

Considering that the future belongs to the educated, is there any guarantee that Judaism and the *non possumus* theory can continue to co-exist for any length of time? and can this be real conservatism which shuts its eyes to the "what next," satisfied with "if there be only peace in my days"? Such was not the principle of Jewish conservatism of old. It asked, "Who is wise"? and replied "He who sees what is to come." These lectures were intended to show how, in the face of ever-

changing vicissitudes and convictions, and the rise of new wants, physical as well as mental, Jewish conservatives, such as were the most wise and far-sighted among the chiefs of the Synhedrion, met the exigencies of their times. They did not in the hour of peril fold their arms and lay unction to their souls by calling out *non possumus*, but were up and doing, and, like a wise and humane surgeon, did not hesitate to amputate a gangrened limb if the operation was the only means of saving—*i.e.* conserving life. Such, in the opinion of the lecturer, is the true mission of the conservative. He does not embalm mummies, but serves the living. The corpses he decently buries, but sedulously takes care of that in which there is the spark of life.

But, if reform is necessary, by whom is it to be effected? This leads to the consideration of the third object of these lectures. In the course of the many centuries which have passed since the extinction of the Synhedrion, attempts at reform have been made by provincial synods, and even by single congregations. In justification of these attempts may be pleaded the necessities of the times, but they certainly cannot lay claim to authority. This authority was vested exclusively in the Synhedrion, whether called into life by a direct popular vote at a time when Judaism was fully consolidated and the exigencies of a new period made themselves keenly felt, or was the gradual and slow product springing from a nation's innermost life, receiving afterwards legal sanction. The Synhedrion, while it existed, was the true expression of Judaism's religious will, and the legitimate representative of its highest religious aspirations and most deeply felt religious

wants. It knew how to entwine itself round the national heart and obtain voluntary recognition. The prestige of the name has survived to this day. If the Synhedrion itself is extinct, the authority which created it, and the examples which it set, still exist. Its footprints were not marked in sand; they are deeply impressed upon the national religion. The Synhedrion alone, history teaches, had the right to modify, and even suspend, if not abolish old institutions, and establish or sanction new ones necessitated in the course of time.

The Synhedrion expired in consequence of the stress of stormy times. Why could it not be revived in consequence of the favour of happier days? The authority which created the Synhedrion resided in the popular will: that still exists; and what obstacle in our days is there in the way to its exercise? None. There is gravity, there is learning, there is piety, and there is good will enough among the Jews of Austria, Germany, France, Italy, England and America to call such a body into existence, and means enough among them to sustain it. The congresses of men of science and of some professions show in what way sessions might be held. The delegates of the several sections of Israel, elected in conformity with certain rules previously agreed upon, might meet from time to time in such leading congregations as might be willing to receive them. Such a central authority once created, there will be no longer room, nor, indeed, occasion for isolated, if not illegitimate, attempts at reform, the only excuse for which at present is the absence of all legitimate means for satisfying the undeniable and just demands of an age so radically differing from its predecessors.

Nor need these reforms confine themselves to mere modifications in the expression of divine worship to which they are now mainly restricted. Reform would then be in a position to cope with the real difficulties of the position. After all it is a matter of minor importance, perhaps scarcely worth contending for, breaking the uniformity, if not the unity, of worship, and disturbing the harmony of communities—whether prayers are to commence an hour sooner or later, whether certain portions are to be modified, abridged, or omitted altogether. To apply to such changes the incisive term reform is almost a misnomer. It is calling a pigmy by the name of a giant, and unnecessarily frightening the mass. Reform does not stop at the examination of the expresion of divine worship, but investigates the principle of worship itself. Reform does not content itself with coping with mere ephemeral phenomena—the symptoms of a disease—but goes to the root of the disease itself, and endeavours to apply a remedy. Its efforts must be continuous, even as the insidious attacks of the disease itself. A reforming authority that is not continuous, and constantly on the watch, may, after a time, become as great, if not even a greater, impediment than any removed by it. Indeed, a rabbi distinctly declared (Jerus. Talmud Sanhedrin, 80) that, were the law considered as absolutely completed, it could have no stability. Another rabbi taught "The destruction of Jerusalem took place because the judges judged (without consulting the spirit) according to the letter of the law (Talm. Treat. Baba. Metzeeah, f. 30).

In this respect Judaism differs from Christianity, especially Protestant Christianity. Christianity, es-

pecially Protestant Christianity, may be defined as Judaism *minus* all its institutions, *plus* a number of new-fangled dogmas. While retaining the framework of Judaism, Christianity has taken care to overhaul its contents, to cast out as so much lumber all its practices, to re-arrange and modify its moral principles, and to fill up the numerous and large gaps with doctrinal matter. Christianity having thus possessed itself of the liberty of ordering its daily life, in accordance with its ever varying views and wants, a conflict between them can never arise. It therefore stands in no need of an authority for mediating between them.

Christianity, of course, has its conflicts ; but these are of a nature quite different from those perceived in Judaism. They are between doctrine and reason—between faith and science. Intermediation is here not called for, simply because it is impracticable. There is no room for authority. One of the two antagonists must be swallowed up by the other. There can be no peace while both occupy the field. The universe is not large enough for them ; but Judaism is quite differently constituted. As the custodian of certain great principles, it prescribes to its followers distinctive practices manifesting themselves to the outer world. Conflicts with every day life, ever varying views, and new wants must, therefore, arise in every generation. A provision, consequently, for meeting this foreseen exigency must be made, and has been made (Deut. xvii., 8-12), and it found its highest and fullest developed exponent in the Synhedrion.

In process of time it fell, and what was the consequence? The living authoritative interpreter of the

Written Word having disappeared, there was vacillation for a time. The effect of the absence of this legitimate ruling authority may be aptly described—*mutatis mutandis*—in the Scriptural phrase "In those days there was no king in Israel; every one did what seemed right in his eyes." The conflict between life and institutions, continuing the Synhedrial office, was undertaken *without mandate* by provisional and even local authorities. At last these also ceased, and there remained nothing but an unwieldy accumulation of volumes of other written words. But the provision described in Deuteronomy was to be breathing—sharing in the movements of life, capable of appreciating its complications, feeling and beating in unison with the heart of the age, and responding to its sentiments. The provision made by the self-deputed successors of the Synhedrion was a heap of dead letters, overlying each other, like the withering leaves blown off a vigorous tree by the keen autumnal blast. Life having fled from them they are incapable of imparting life.

But, perhaps, it will be argued that a Synhedrion in our days will be a dignity, and not a power. To this it may be replied, that this is precisely as it should be. A religious authority should never be more than a dignity. Woe to the religious body which, in addition to dignity, vests its authority with power, and, alas for the religion which claims for its authority something beyond dignity, which requires power to sustain itself; for deeply embedded in it lie the germs of the inquisition. A religious authority will, as a rule, possess precisely as much power as the practice of virtue at all times gives to the pure and saintly.

But, it may be asked, Will not a Synhedrion end by creating a new sect instead of uniting all sections? It may be answered, that the creation of a Synhedrion should be attempted at the very risk of creating a new sect. A sect in whose veins there throbs a vigorous life is preferable to a whole people languidly professing a long established religious system, threatened with dissolution from sheer inanition; and if a sect, by its friction against lethargic bodies, should succeed in bringing warmth into their torpid limbs, this alone would be merit enough, and an ample atonement for any incidental mischief it might work. But why should it end by the creation of a new sect? The immoveable ones who might continue to take their stand upon the dead letter, by which they are now guided, could not consistently deny the right of an authority to which they are indebted for this very dead letter; and the indifferent worldlings, and the unreflecting, would simply remain outside the new circle, even as they now stand outside the pale of the dead letter authority. They would as little *then* deem it expedient to proceed to active opposition as they do *now*; while the thoughtful, anxious to place reform on its true basis, and to carry it out in conformity with the existing legal provision, would derive from submission to its guidance that conscientious satisfaction, and that sweet mental tranquillity which obedience to duly constituted legitimate authorities never fails to yield to those longing after internal peace and harmony. After all this submission to authority, if resting on the conviction of superior qualifications for the task, is deeply rooted in one of the most wholesome instincts of human nature. Instances

of this are of daily occurrence. Thus, when a man feels that he is getting seriously ill, he does not physic himself, but takes proper medical advice; and if he be involved in some legal difficulty, he engages the services of one educated for the law.

There is yet another reason for the advocacy of there-establishment of a Synhedrion. Time was when the Jew was immured in his ghetto. Familiar intercourse between Jew and Gentile was as abhorrent to the one as to the other. The distance between them was mental as much as physical. Jew and Gentile only met for some business transaction—very often in the sharply defined capacity of inferior and superior; but now Jew and Gentile, in nearly all civilised countries, meet on a footing of equality. The bars of the ghetto have been removed. Judah's sons and daughters are constantly meeting their equals belonging to other denominations in most intimate relations of life. Their intercourse is close, whether they are listening to the common teacher in the elementary schools, competing in the halls of science, in the forum or the mart, or enlivening the domestic circle and festive board. Whether parents approve of it or not, intimacies of the tenderest nature will spring up between the young of the two sexes; but passion in the young is stronger than reason in the old. In the long run reason will have to give way to passion. And what is the consequence? That the unions which result from these intimacies generally end in an estrangement from the ancestral religion, frequently extending to a much wider circle than it embraced originally; and, this not because of the law of the land interposes—for, Russia excepted, there is probably

at this moment no country in Europe which forbids her inhabitants to choose and change their religion at pleasure—but because Judaism, as the dark bygone days shaped it, offers no room for shelter to an alien.

True, Judaism is not a proselytising religion. It does not lay itself out for converts. The duty of making proselytes is not imposed upon its followers. But, on the other hand, the sacred duty is imposed upon it to endeavour to keep within its fold those born in it. Nay, it holds that those born in its fold can never forfeit their claim to its rights, and even considers the offspring of a Jewish mother, whoever the father, by birth a member of the Jewish community. "What cannot be cured must be endured," and since it is not in the power of the Jewish community to prevent intermarriages, such as referred to, it becomes its duty to find out means to retain the person contracting such a union, as well as the offspring thereof, if belonging to the fold, and pave the way for the other contracting party to take shelter in the same fellowship as the surest means for attaining the desired object. This could be best accomplished by the re-establishment of the order of the Proselytes of the Gate, which existed while the temple stood, and only fell into desuetude in consequence of the disfavour and pressure of the times, which were out of joint for so many ages. A Synhedrion could remove all the difficulties in the way. A Proselyte of the Gate, while acknowledging all the principles underlying Judaism, without being bound to its practices, would naturally be inclined to enter into spiritual fellowship with it, and could have no objection to the continuance of the partner in the community from which he or she

sprang, and the introduction into it of the children born to them. Intermarriages out of the fold would, under these conditions, cease to entail losses on the Jewish community.

The re-establishment of the order of the Proselytes of the Gate, moreover—and here the lecturer comes to his fourth and last object—would enable Judaism to discharge another of its most sacred duties referred to in the Bible repeatedly and emphatically, and faithfully practiced until brutal force interposed. If the primary mission of Israel is to preserve for the benefit of mankind the knowledge of those great and luminous religions and moral principles which underlie Judaism, and of which the latter is the outward manifestation, the secondary is the diffusion of this knowledge among mankind, not for the purpose of proselytising—for a religion which does not claim salvation as a monopoly for its professors has no object to serve by making converts—but for the purpose of guarding from error and offering a harbour of refuge to those driven to and fro, without rudder and compass, on the sea of doubt by the irreconcilable conflict between science and faith. It is as though Providence had preserved Judaism through all the storms and perils of so many dark ages for this very purpose ; or, to use another simile, it is as though Judaism had been kept back, like a reserve, to break forth in the critical moment, and thus to decide the day. But, in order to enable Israel to discharge this part of its mission, it must restore the order of the Proselytes of the Gate, and this can only be effected by a Synhedrion for reasons developed in the last lecture.

The lecturer is well aware that these are not ideas likely, at first sight, to find favour in the eyes of his co-religionists ; but he is also aware that many an idea for a long time dwelling solitarily in an individual mind has, in due season become the *mot d'ordre* of multitudes. The word uttered by the voice that crieth in the wilderness in one age may become the watchword of its successor. The seed corn herewith scattered abroad may wither and die, but it may also take root and bear fruit. Of all the nations of Europe the English is the most practical, and its Jewish section undoubtedly partakes of this characteristic. If it be difficult to move Englishmen, their action is steady and sustained if once moved to action. The formation of an association for diffusing these ideas, elucidating them, and for interesting Jewish minds in them, and working for the removal of the obstacles now barring the way to their realisation, would be quite in keeping with the Anglo-Jewish character. May Germans indulge in philosophical disquisitions and hair-splitting distinctions at the enunciation of these ideas, and Frenchmen in smiles and witticisms, it becomes the grave Englishman to ponder on the situation and weigh it, reject these ideas if found wanting; but take them up in earnest if deserving support. With one of the ancients, on the eve of a battle, the lecturer calls out, "Strike, but hear!"

NOTES.

(1.) Such a rendering, for instance, is that of Isaiah vii. 14, where the Hebrew word which means " young woman" is translated " virgin."

(2.) The subject is discussed in Baba Bathra xv. and Menachoth xxx. of the Babyl. Talmud.

(3.) Several Psalms, as their contents show, must have been composed in the time of the Maccabees; for instance, Psalms 74 and 79. The Book of Chronicles could only have been added to the Canon long after Ezra (about 312 B.C.) as shown by Zunz in his " Gottesdienstliche Vortraege," chap. ii., p. 32.

(4.) See Gesenius' Hebrew Lex., *sub voce.*

(5.) So great was the awe with which this name inspired the people, that the high-priest alone was allowed to utter it, and this only once a year, on the Day of Atonement, when entering the Most Holy. On all other occasions a word meaning Lord was substituted for it.—Mishnah Yoma, xi., 2.

(6.) This apprehension in the minds of these theologians probably owes its origin to what they witnessed in the daughter religion. In their opinion the founders of this religion were misled by the manner in which some of the prophets in their poetical strains personified one of the divine attributes, and spoke of it as the Holy Spirit, or rather, as it is in Hebrew, the spirit of holiness. These founders, therefore, considered it as a being distinct from the Deity, transforming it into the third person of the Trinity. " The contest between the Attributists and Non-attributists," said the late Emanuel Deutsch (Literary Remains, p. 193) "was indeed one of the fiercest and bitterest, and each camp boasted of brilliant champions." But the latter carried the day, led by no meaner authorities than Ibn Ezra, Iehuda Halevi, and Maimonides. The last of these goes the length of calling the views of his antagonists anti-Jewish. The subject is fully discussed in Dr. A. Schmiedl's " Studien über Jüdische Religions-Philosophie " (Vienna, 1869). It may not be out of place to mention that this controversy had not its origin in Judaism, but in Mahometanism. The school of the *Mutazilites*, as early as the year 750 C.E., contended for the same principle.

(7.) The following quotation from Tacitus (Historiar. lib. v. sect. 4) will show what the educated and enlightened Romans of the period thought of Judaism and the Jews :—" Moses, that he might attach the nation for ever to himself, introduced rites, new and in opposition to the rest of mankind ; all things we hold sacred are there profane, and what we deem abominable are with them permitted." And again, " They slaughter the ram in sacrifice, as if in contempt of Ammon, and they slso offer up an ox which the Egyptians worship under the name of Apis." He further charges them with a hostile feeling toward the rest of mankind, and declares that " those who adopt their principles and customs not only use circumcision, but are taught to despise their own gods, to renounce their country, and to hold in contempt brothers, children, and parents."

(8.) It is noteworthy that we read of no persecution of the Jews among the Teutons and Slaves while they were Pagan.

(9.) The several meanings of the word in question are fully discussed by Maimonides in his Moreh Nebuch. chap. 40, and by Spinoza, in his Tract. Theolog. Polit., c. I.

(10.) The rabbi referred to is Rabbi Abraham Ben David of Montpellier, a distinguished Talmudist, who (in his " Animadversions upon the Mishnah Torah, Sepher Hamadaa," c. I.), thinks that Maimonides was not justified in condemning in such strong language the material notions entertained (by some) of the Deity. The notions of the Kabbalists on creation are lucidly set forth by Munk, in his Palestine, p. 523.

(11.) Compare Exod. xxxii., 33, and Deut. xxiv., 16. In both these passages it is distinctly declared that guilt cannot be transferred, and that its consequences must be borne by the sinner, and no one else.

(12.) Such, however, was not the opinion of many rabbis, who, by an interpretation of their own given to a certain text, endeavoured to show that prayer was a duty prescribed by the law, only that it was not stated when prayers were to be offered.

(13.) Future life, as believed in by the Egyptians of old, is fully discussed by Professor Dœllinger in " The Gentile and the Jew in the Courts of the Temple of Christ " (Vol. I., Egypt, p. 460). Sharpe, in his History of Egypt (vol. I., c. iii, p. 146), says, " The Egyptian priests were the first to teach that a man does not wholly die when life leaves the body. They said that after death the soul dwelt in the bodies of

other animals, and was there imprisoned for its sins during a number of other short lives, and, that after thus passing for three thousand years through the bodies of birds, beasts, and fishes, it was again allowed to take upon itself a human covering. Hence, they carefully saved the dead body from decay by embalming it in a manner that it might be ready for the soul to re-enter when the years of banishment were at an end."

(14.) This subject has been fully discussed in Warburton's "Divine Legation," (B. VI., Sect. VI.); further by Graves in his "Lectures on the four last books of the Pentateuch" (Part III., Sect. III.).

(15.) We quote the following from Dœllinger's "The Jew and the Gentile in the Courts of the Temple of Christ," (vol. I. Egypt, p. 475-476):—"Besides sacrifices of beasts, the gods had regularly such oblations of articles of food and incense made them. . . . King Thotmes III. had it recorded in his annals that he presented his (deceased deified) father Ra-Ammon, with 828 doorkeepers of both sexes, besides four cows for milk, which was daily set before the god at sunset in golden pails; he sums up the number of geese and loaves, besides incense, wine and fruits, he had presented for the daily oblations, and tells us how he had given the god (his deified father) three cities, the yearly revenues of which were to cover the daily expense of the meats of sacrifice. The long list of sacrificial gifts and presents further mentions linen stuff, gold, silver, whole fields, meadows and ponds (Birch Archael. xxxv., 130-154.) Undoubtedly the priests appropriated to themselves the repasts daily spread before the god. In inscriptions on their tombs it is frequently recorded that they had taken the cakes which had belonged to the tables of the gods." Sharpe, in his "History of Egypt" (vol. I., c. i., p. 59), thus describes the trial after death:—"That solemn trial of every man for his conduct in this life, which was to fix his reward or punishment in the next, was enacted by the priests as part of the funeral ceremony. Instead of following with the family as so many hired mourners, they put on masks distinctive of the several gods, and thus received the body in due form. Osiris sat on a raised throne, holding his two sceptres and wearing the crown of Upper Egypt. Before him were placed the offerings and the bitch Cerberus, and near him were seated the four lesser gods of the dead. The deceased holds up his hands in prayer, and is introduced by two goddesses, each wearing on her head the emblem of truth. A large pair of scales is set up which is adjusted by the dog-headed Anubis and the hawk-headed Horus. In one scale is placed the heart or conduct of the

deceased, and in the other a figure of the goddess of truth. A small weight is moved along the beam by Horus to make the two scales balance and to determine how much the conduct falls short of the standard weight. . . . . Forty-two assessors are at hand to assist Osiris in forming his judgment, which, when pronounced, is written down by the Ibis-headed Thoth" (See c. viii., p. 324). Having described a bargain made by the Theban priests for participation in collections made for the dead of certain districts, he continues "The custom of giving offerings to the priests for the good of the dead, would seem to have been a source of some wealth to the temples, and must have been common even in the time of Moses."

(16) It can not, however, be denied that this equality was in a great measure in subequent ages rendered nugatory by rabbinical interpretations, clearly in opposition to the text of Scripture. But these interpretations did not commence until Gentiles had proved themselves fierce oppressors and persecutors of the Jews. The rabbis must have possessed natures high above the general standard, or deep below it, had they not resented these persecutions and retaliated upon their deadly foes in the only way they could. It is noteworthy that as Gratz has all but proved the eighteen rabbinical enactments against the heathen (Mishnah Sabbath xiii., 6) were made shortly before the destruction of the second temple—consequently, amid the throes of a sanguinary war of extermination against Rome, which was assisted by all the neighbouring nations. It can further be shown that the severity of these enactments, intended to effect a total separation between Jew and Gentile, was mitigated, or even explained away, when more friendly social relations prevailed between them. At all events, the coincidence is remarkable that in the reign of the Emperor Claudius, who proved gracious to the Jews, Gamaliel the elder should have decreed (Talm. Ghittin lix, 6) that the poor of the heathen should not be prevented gleaning in the fields of the Jews; that the poor of the heathen should be cared for the same as those of the Jews; that the sick of the heathen should be nursed, the last honours be paid to their dead, and the mourners comforted; and that in the Parthian dominions, where the Jews were well treated in the days of Samuel, this rabbi should have taught that many enactments unfriendly to the Gentiles were only applicable to Palestine (Talm. Aboda Sara., vii, 6), and that he was not opposed to all intercourse between Jews and the Magi (Talm. Sabbath 75, a).

(17). It is remarkable how anxious the rabbis were that this war of

extermination should not be drawn into a precedent. Without the slightest warrant from Scripture, simply appealing to tradition, they maintain that Joshua, before attacking the seven nations, had to offer them the alternative of either peaceful submission or expatriation. It was only after the refusal of the alternative that he was allowed to attack them. How humane the sentiments of the rabbis were in quiet times, when not driven into despair by ferocious persecution, will appear from the following, which is only one of numerous similar effusions scattered all over the Talmud. At the time that the Holy One,—blessed be He—said to Saul "go and smite Amalek" (I Sam. xv., 3), he replied "If a corpse was found in the field and the murderer could not be discovered, the law commanded the elders of the neighbouring city to offer a heifer with great solemnity, and deprecate the divine wrath from their heads (Deut. xxii., 9), how much more heinous the offence if multitudes are to be slain. Then, again, if the human beings are guilty, what is the crime of the cattle to be killed likewise? And if the adults sinned, what is the fault of the little ones?" Then a heavenly voice was heard saying, "Do not be over-righteous" (Eccles. vii., 15). (Yoma. 22, b.)

(18). The harsh interpretation originally given to the text in question was in practice greatly softened down, until in process of time an almost perfect equality between husband and wife was established in matters of divorce (see Gratz's History of the Jews vol. v., pp. 142-143).

(19). The solicitude for the maintenance of a widow went so far that her claim was the first on the property of her deceased husband. This provision was made by Simon ben Shetach, as stated in Talm. Jerus, Ketubot, 8.

(20). A learned friend has furnished the lecturer with a number of very interesting notes on this subject; but, as they are lengthy, and, moreover, do not admit of being sufficiently popularised for the general reader, the results only will here be stated:—1. Tradition justified by Biblical data, fixed the giving of the ten commandments to have taken place on the sixth day of the month of Iyar. 2. No festival was appointed for the celebration of this event because it was held that it should be incessantly borne in mind, commemorated, as it were, every day. 3. As late as the days of the earlier Talmudists no connexion existed between the festival in question and the revelation on Sinai. The first traces of this connection are found in the third century, when the calendar began to be fixed by Rabbi Ada, and care was taken that the

sixth day of Iyar should always coincide with the first day of the feast of Weeks. 4. The first mention of this connexion in the ritual by the insertion of the phrase, "The time of the giving of our law" is made by Rabbi Yizchak ben Shesheth, in the thirteenth century. 5. The unauthorised, or, perhaps, more correctly, the incidental nature of this connexion is shown, as observed by Hezekiah ben David de Silva, in his "Peree Chadash," by the circumstance that the phrase in the ritual referred to does not run, "Festival of the giving of the law" after the analogy of 'feast of unleavened cakes,' or feast of tabernacles,' but 'feast of weeks the time (or anniversary) of the giving of the law.'

(21). In consequence of discrepancies between certain passages in Ezekiel and the Pentateuch, there was a strong feeling among the rabbis to exclude the former from the canon. We do not hear on this occasion that any popular opposition was apprehended; ultimately, however, it was resolved to retain it in the canon, as one of the rabbis successfully undertook the explanation of these discrepancies. The whole account may be read in the Tal. Treat. Sabbath, chapter i., 5. xii., 2. And elsewhere (Treat. Sabbath, chap. ii., xxx., 2) we read of the intention of the rabbis to exclude the Book of Koheleth (Ecclesiastes) from the canon, because, as was contended, its contents, or at least some of them, were at variance with the Law. This idea, it is true, was ultimately relinquished, but the Book of Sirach (Meshalim) composed about 260 years before the destruction of the second temple was, according to Zunz, actually excluded from the canon, in which it was still included as late as the beginning of the fourth century (see Zunzs' Gottesdienstl. Vortraeg. chap. vii., pp. 101-102).

(22.) Traditions of this kind were believed to have been handed down by Moses from Sinai, having been transmitted orally from master to disciple, until they were at last recorded in the Talmud, forming the most ancient part of the oral law. They were technically called, *Halakah Lemosheh Mesinai* (gone forth unto Moses from Sinai).

(23.) Different rabbis laid down different rules. Hillel laid down seven; Rabbi Yishmael thirteen (Sifra, sec. I), and Rabbi Elieser, son of R. Yossay, the Gallilean, thirty-two (Aboth of Rabbi Nathan).

(24.) [The figure of this note has by an oversight been misplaced; its proper place is after the full stop, in line 25 of the same page, 59.] Zunz, in his Gottesdienstl. Vortraeg. (chap. iii, p. 37) places the formation of the Synhedrion at about 142 B.C. The interpretation

given to the concluding words of the passage quoted, (v. 11) "Thou shalt not decline from the sentence which they shall show thee to the right hand nor to the left," is "Even if they (the Synhedrion) were to tell thee of the right that it is the left, and of the left that it is the right, thou art bound by the sentence."—(See Commentary of Rashi —as quoted from Sifree—on this verse).

(25.) The rabbis resolved the law of retaliation (Exod. xxi, 24-25) into pecuniary compensation (Talmud Treat. Baba Kama, f. 83, b.) The reasons may be seen in the Biur, on the passage in Exodus just quoted. Calmet, who had not penetrated into the spirit of the rabbis, observed, "The Hebrew jurisconsults have disfigured this law (of retaliation), the same as all others which were odious to them; they have introduced so many individual views *(tant de temperament)*, so many restrictions, exceptions, and subterfuges, that it is almost impossible ever to incur the punishment prescribed by the law *(Calmet dissert. sur la police des anciens Hebreux*, towards the end).

(26.) Much has been written on the religious differences between the Pharisees and Sadducees. But it is only in modern time that the subject has been sufficiently elucidated for criticism to pronounce its judgment. It is especially Geiger who has thrown much light on the question, by a careful study of Talmudical sources, as may be seen from his latest publication, entitled, "Sadducees and Pharisees." That the Sadducees did not deny the immortality of the soul is shown by Gratz, in vol. III, p. 508 of his History of the Jews.

(27.) The Ptolemies, reversing the policy of the Persian rulers of Egypt, supported the established religion, and greatly increased the power and influence of the priests over the people. Of the first of those kings, Ptolemy Soter, we read that he spent the sum of fifty talents on the burial of a dead Apis, and that the inner sanctuary of the great temple at Karnak, destroyed by the Persians, was rebuilt by him (see Dœllinger's "The Jew and the Gentile," &c., vol. I. b. vi, p. 407.)

(28) It is true that this resolve was originally taken by Matathias and his followers; but as subsequently it became a general rule that defence in war on Sabbath was lawful, and should not be considered as a desecration of the festival, it must have received the sanction of the Synhedrion, and may therefore be considered in the light of an enactment made by this body.

(29) In the Mishnah (Beracoth, ix., 5) we read, "All benedictions

recited in the temple concluded with the words "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel for ever." But when the *Meenim* adduced this as a proof that there is only this world it was ordained that the phraseology should be precisely that used in Nehemiah (ix., 5) "for ever and ever." It is true that the term Meenim in the rabbinical writings, mostly designate the Jewish Christians. But as these neither denied the resurrection of the dead, nor the immortality of the soul, the word in question must, in the passage quoted, refer to the Sadducees who, as known, denied the resurrection.

(30) We read in the Talmud (Treat., Sotah f. 22. b.) the rabbis taught. There are seven kinds of Pharisees—the Shechemites, the crawlers, the eye distorters, the downcasts, the professors of the *opus operatum*, the hunters after reward, and the anxious. The Shechemites are those who, like Shechem, discharged religious duties for the sake of an earthly reward (Gen. xxxiv., 2–5). Crawlers are like those who, on account of excess of humility, do not raise their feet in walking, and therefore knock them against stones and other impediments. Eye distorters are those who, in order to avoid looking at a woman, shut their eyes in walking, and therefore knock their heads against walls which inflict wounds from which blood flows. Downcasts are those who, to avoid every appearance of pride, walk bent double. Professors of the *opus operatum* are those who boast that they have fulfilled all the commandments of the law, and are ready to fulfil any other that may be pointed out to them. The hunters after reward are those who fulfil the law, not for love of it and the fear of God, but because they desire the reward promised to the observant. The anxious are those who obey the law for fear of the punishment threatened to the disobedient. King Yannai (Hyrcanus) said (on his death-bed) to his queen: Fear neither the Pharisees nor the non-Pharisees, but fear the dyed ones (hypocrites) who act like Simri (Numb. xxv., 14), and want to be rewarded like Phineas (Ibid., 11). The yannai here referred to is the Alexander Hyrcanus of Josephus, who from a Pharisee became a Sadducee, and who on his death-bed recommended to his queen and successor, Alexandra, to make her peace with the Pharisees and be guided by their advice.

(31) Munk (Palestine, p. 600) having described this terrible struggle, concludes his graphic account thus: Telle fut l'issue de cette guerre effrayable, qui termina l'existence politique de la nation Juive, dont l'heroïque résistance, après la soumission de tout l'Orient, humilia l'orgueil de Rome; *augebat iras*, dit tacite *quod soli Judaei non*

cessissent. La lutte fut glorieuse, unique peut-être dans les annals des nations. La catastrophe est une des plus effrayantes, dont l'histoire nous ait conservé le souvenir. Jerusalem fut plus grandiose dans sa chute qu'elle ne l'avait jamais été aux jours de sa magnificence. Les fiers Ramains durent admirer le courage indomptable des Juifs et cet ardent amour de la patrie qui leur faisait craindre la vie bien plus que la mort dès qu'on voulait les arracher au sol paternal," and makes the following quotation from Tacitus (Hist., v. 13): "Arma cunctis qui ferre possent; et plures, quam pro numero, audebant. Obstinatio viris feminis par; ac, si transferre sedes cogerentur major vitae metus quam mortis."

(32) Indications of this hatred appeared soon after the war, for by a decree of the Synhedrion every contact with the Jewish Christians was forbidden (Talmud Treat. Abodah Sarah, f. 16, b. Midrash Koheleth 84, d, to the verse, Col Hadebarim). A special formula under the name of Bircath Hammeenim was added to the so-called eighteen benedictions as a kind of test in order to discover the favourers of the new doctrine. This hatred naturally also extended to the religious writings of the new sect. Despite the popular veneration for the name of the Deity, and the awe which it inspired, the Christian writings, even if containing these names, were allowed to be burnt (Ibid. Sabbath, f. 116, a.; Jerusalem Talmud, Ibid c. xvi., p. 16, 3). The followers of the new sect naturally retaliated. The same authorities tell us that the Christians denounced the Jews to the Romans, and calumniated them. Gratz, in his History of the Jews (vol. iv., p. 103–105), speaks of the mutual enmity and the attacks upon one another. This hatred was still more increased during the insurrection of Barcochba against Hadrian, the Jews having wished the Christians to make common cause with them, which however was refused. Eusebius (Chron. to the 17th year of Hadrian) recorded that this Jewish leader "plurimos Christianos diversis suppliciis affecit eo quod noluissent proficisci cum illo pugnatum contra Romanos." Not only did they stand aloof during this struggle, but, in common with the Samaritans, are suspected with having strenuously exerted themselves to get revoked the permission granted by Hadrian to the Jews before the outbreak of the insurrection to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem (Gratz, Ibid, pp. 140–141). This conduct of the Jewish Christians must have been the more painful to the Jews the more strongly it contrasted with that of Izates and his brothers princes of Adiabene, who having embraced Judaism, warmly espoused the cause of their new co-religionists, and fought against Titus, as we are informed by Josephus.

(33.) Suetonius (Domitianus, c. 12) gives an account of a most humiliating bodily examination to which a hoary man had to submit, in order to ascertain whether he was a Jew, and consequently liable to the special tax imposed upon his race.

(34.) It was said of rabbi Yochanan ben Saccai that he left not (uninvestigated) the Bible, the Mishnah, the Ghemara, the Halachahs, the Haggadahs, the subtleties of the law, and the subtleties of the scribes . . . the easy things and the difficult things (Bab. Bath. 134, a) Comp. Succ. 28, a.) Again, in Nedarim, vi, 7, we read, "Hillel, the elder, had eighty pair of disciples. The youngest among them was rabbi Yochanan ben Saccai. One day Hillel fell sick and all of them came to visit him; only rabbi Yochanan remained in the court. Hillel upon this asked "Where is the youngest among you, who is a father in wisdom and a father to (future) generations?" When he entered Hillel said, "That I may cause those that love me to inherit substance; and I will fill their treasures" (Prov. viii, 21). It was a principle with rabbi Yochanan never to make an enactment that might prove too burdensome to the majority of the people (Tal. Baba Bathra, f. 60, b.)

(35.) As late as the year 270, C.E., the Messiah was still daily expected by the Jews. Thus rabbi Yoshua ben Levi taught that the Messiah was at Rome, in momentary expectation of the call to bring about Israel's deliverance (Talm. Sanhed. f. 98, a.)

(36.) The rabbinical dictum in regard to these prayers was, "Prayers have been introduced corresponding with the daily sacrifices" (Numb. xxviii, 3 & 4), and these obligatory prayers had to be offered up during the hours prescribed for the offering up of these sacrifices while the temple stood (Mishnah Beracoth, c. 4). The well-known formulas of these prayers, contained in every prayer-book, are very ancient, so ancient, indeed, that the early rabbis themselves no longer knew their authors, and ascribed their composition to the men of the great synagogue. They have, however, in process of time been modified, and several additions made to them. There can be little doubt that Jesus and His apostles substantially offered up the same prayers as the Jews do to this day.

(37) Zunz (Gottesdieustlich. Vortraege, pp. 1, 2, 12) has shown that prayer was not the primary object of the meetings at synagogue, since prayers could also be offered up in private. The primary object was, as implied by the name, the meetings themselves, which were viewed in the light of a homage to the Deity, and that in these

meetings the reading, translation, and exposition of the Scripture were resorted to as means for instruction and edification.

(38) This inconsiderate adhesion to custom was carried so far that when the Jews beyond the Euphrates wished to discontinue the celebration of the second day festivals, the colleges of Palestine, then still considered as the leading authorities in religious matters, warned them against this with the words: "Beware of the customs of your fathers, which are in your hands" (Tal. Betsa, 4, b). A similar message was sent to the Jews of Alexandria (Jerus. Tal. Erubin iii). The legal maxim, "*Modus et consuetudo vincunt legem*" was applied by the rabbis to religious matters.

(39) It is true modern criticism has established that the Mishnah, as a whole, was not reduced to writing until the middle of the sixth century (see Gratz's History of the Jews, vol. IV. note xxxv, p. 404). But, as down to Luzzatto, it was believed that the Mishnah was not only compiled but also written down by Rabbi Yehudah, the Prince, in the latter half of the second century, and the explanation of the text quoted was considered as a sufficient reason for the innovation, the discovery referred to practically does not affect the position taken. It only transfers the act commented upon from the second to the sixth century, and gives the position taken still more strength, by showing that, owing to the pressure of circumstances, the grave innovation was ventured on at a period when the Synhedrion was extinct, and when, therefore, no authority was in existence that could sanction this departure from an ancient practice, and this, too, by rabbis (Gisa and Simona) *comparatively* little known in rabbinical writings. In this statement has been followed the general opinion of the rabbis, as expressed by Maimonides in his preface to his Mishnah Torah, where the reason for this innovation is stated.

(40) There can be little doubt but that the earlier rabbis considered scriptural applications of this kind as mere pegs, and not as the justificatory reasons for the conclusions arrived at. Such pegs intended to form a serviceable association of ideas, attaching some new statement which is to be impressed on the memory to some old, well-known, and venerable one, drawn from the stores of the Bible, are often referred to in the Talmud under the designation of "Assemacta Bealma" and are a kind of mnemonics, very useful at a time when all studies of this nature were carried on by the word of mouth, as it was not lawful to put them in writing. But it is equally true that later on the original use of these pegs was lost sight of, and that instead thereof they were con-

sidered as the pillars supporting the weight of the decisions based upon them, and as such were productive of the mischief pointed out.

(41) The persecutions, in consequence of which these and several other institutions had to be disregarded, are described by Gratz, in his History of the Jews (vol. IV. c. 7, p. 170 to the end of the chapter.) Persecutions of this nature were of frequent occurrence ever since the reign of the Emperor Hadrian, and to them must be ascribed the decay of numerous institutions which would have served to single out the faithful to their enemies. It is noteworthy that it was then authoritatively decided that a Jew was bound to take upon himself the fate of the martyr if idolatry, fornication, or murder were required of him. Every other commandment he was allowed to transgress if he could save his life thereby.

(42) A brief account of this synod, or rather meeting of a number of rabbis, at Mayence, under the presidency of Rabbainu Ghershon, the most famous rabbi of his age in western Europe (he died in 1028) will be found in the history of the Jews referred to before (vol. v, p. 406).

(43.) This subject is fully discussed by Gratz (History of the Jews, vol. iv, note 7, p. 428), in which he shows that Rabbi Akiba a (contemporary of the Emperor Hadrian) was the restorer of this method brought forward before the destruction of the temple, now restored and amplified by him, and that it ultimately prevailed over the opposite opinion held by Rabbi Yishmael, and was accepted by the rabbis as a rule for the interpretation of the law.

(44.) The Talmud in this respect teaches that the study of the Scripture is less meritorious than that of the Mishnah; that of the Mishnah less than that of the *Ghemara*; that of the *Ghemara* is the most meritorious (Baba Metzeeah, c. ii, towards the end). Dicta of a similar tenor are also found in other parts of the Talmud.

(45). Not only can rational Biblical criticism be traced to the Karaites but also rationalism itself. Kheevee Haccalbee, a Karaite (as quoted and refuted by Aben Ezra in Exod. xiv. 27). asserted that the passage of the Israelites through the Red Sea took place at low water, and thus endeavoured to explain away its miraculous nature, just as centuries after him was done by the German commentator, Michaelis. This opinion was refuted by Niebuhr in his description of Arabia (p. 44). The Manna, too (Exod. xvi. 13.) is explained by the same Karaite as a natural production of the desert, as was done in modern times by some rationalistic Biblical commentators.

(46). As an instance of the rational, if not nationalistic, treatment of the Bible by rabbinical commentators, may be mentioned Aben Ezra, who was the first to hint at the existence of two prophets of the name of Isaiah—the elder Isaiah, co-temporary of King Hezekiah, and the younger who lived in Persia under King Cyrus, whose prophesies were ascribed indiscriminately to one and the same author (see Aben Ezra's Preface to the Commentary on Isaiah). The same commentator observes, in the Preface to his Commentary on Zachariah, "I saw books of sages in France who have explained the visions of Zachariah as referring to events that had past." A sketch of the life of this remarkable man may be found in the Miscellany of Hebrew Literature (published by Trübner). Spinoza's Tractatus Theologico-Politicus can only be viewed in the light of a critical if not rationalistic commentary on those portions of the Bible of which he treated.

(47) The Synhedrion under Napoleon I., in 1807, was a mere meteor which flashed through the horizon of Judaism, hardly leaving any trace behind. It, however, at the same time, caused extraordinary enthusiasm among the Jews, and gained many warm friends and admirers among them, while also showing that the re-establishment of the Synhedrion in our days is practicable. It was convened for the purpose of giving religious sanction to certain resolutions passed by an assembly of Jewish notables, convened by the order of the Emperor (see Gratz's History of the Jews, vol. xi., pp. 291–303).

(48) As an instance, may be quoted the fact that the rabbi just mentioned transferred the seat of the Synhedrion on his own authority against the established rule (Sanhedrion II.) from Jerusalem to Yamnia.

(49) These laws are referred to by Maimonides (Mishnah Torah, Hil. Mel. viii., 10) in these words :—The first man was commanded concerning six things—idolatry, blasphemy, shedding of blood, incest, robbery, and administration of justice. Although we have all these things as a tradition from Moses, our master, and reason inclines to them, yet from the general tenor of the law it appears that he was commanded concerning these things. Noah received an additional command concerning the limb of living animal (not to be eaten), as it is said "But flesh in the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, ye shall not eat" (Gen. ix., 4). Here are the seven commandments, and thus the matter was in all the world until Abraham.

(50). There were anciently two kinds of proselytes. Proselytes of righteousness, who in every respect conformed to the Jewish law, and

who in every particular were considered and treated as Jews. Secondly, Proselytes of the Gate, who simply accepted the seven Noachidae laws, and were admitted to the full enjoyment of all political and civil rights, and only excluded from participation in the performance of certain rites strictly national. The second order has fallen into desuetude.

(51) This view of Maimonides is expressed in Mishnah Torah, Hil. Mel. xi. But as it is coupled with an energetic protest against the claims to the Messiahship of the founder of Christianity, the whole passage, no doubt, owing to the veto of the censorship, is left out in most printed editions. It is, however, contained in the Amsterdam edition of 5462 A.M.

Printed by S. MELDOLA, 7, King Street, Snow Hill London, E.C.